# The Congregational Quarterly

## EDITORIAL

IT is not long since it was widely assumed that if only men of different faiths, races and interests could be brought together round a conference table, differences, divisions and separations would be dissipated in the light and warmth of sweet human reasonableness. Now the conferences have come, but the millennium of peace and unity tarries. It used to be thought that to get to know one another would be to find that we all wanted the same things. That is not yet, if it ever will be, and it is becoming clear that our problem is to find our way to a synthesis of faith, order and action which recognizes and tolerates human differences. It is too soon, either in religion or politics, to say "this is the only way, walk ye in it". Like Habakkuk, we live in the midst of the years, not at the end. This is not to say there is no progress discernible. Where Milton, for example, sought the compassion of God upon "this travailing and throbbing kingdom", our no less urgent intercessions now include whole continents.

* * *

THE United Nations Assembly reveals differences that no present order of thought, much less any existing political organization, wholly comprehends. Even the fundamental *words* are shown to have different meanings. Freedom is interpreted in the greater part of the civilized world to mean freedom to follow the leading of individual conscience subject to the necessary, changing claims of the community. But in Russia, freedom seems to mean freedom to be an orthodox Marxist, with the forbidding provision that what is orthodox shall at any given moment be determined by authority. Similarly, democracy means, in the West, the whole people, but in Russia, only the proletariat. The function, if not the meaning, of truth itself is differently understood. Those who believe in God think, feel and live differently from those for whom dialectical materialism inspires human conduct and accounts for the forces which govern human destiny. The war in which there is no discharge is not yet over, and we must bear ourselves as faithful soldiers and servants, not as those for whom past generations have done, or ought to have done everything to make us secure and comfortable.

* * *

WHAT falls short of the truth as it is revealed to us in Jesus Christ is, we know, fragile and temporary. The freedom we must have is freedom to do the will of God, not merely to become materially rich and powerful. Yet without some measure of riches and power, we shall have no freedom to live by any other will than that of the interpreters of economic forces. The freedom of the dialectical materialist is spiritual slavery. Our dilemma is that we have to live in a world, a great part of which does not agree with us and, so far as it is able, uses the sanctions of force to compel us to agree with it.

* * *

So in the Assembly of the United Nations and elsewhere, to prefer peace to truth will be to lose both. That is why Communists in places of responsibility exceed the bounds of our toleration, and German generals are called upon to answer for war crimes.

* * *

IT would be easier and pleasanter to enmesh ourselves in a rosy veil through which to survey both past and future, but no doubt about the appalling cost of self-deception can survive the reading of the first volume of Mr. Churchill's War memoires, *The Gathering Storm* (Cassel, 25s.). Those of us who lived through those years which the locusts ate between 1930 and 1940 will perhaps have some difficulty in reading this careful précis of events that wounded us so sorely at their happening. It is a tale of tragic blindness, obstinate assurance, reluctance to face unpleasant facts, and determination to cling to the exercise of power such as this country has not known since the days of Ethelred the Unready. The studied moderation of the narrative only emphasizes the moral which lies upon the surface of the events described. In England and France it was the failure of leadership. From the day when the author of *Mein Kampf* began his climb to power the warnings were there. No one has told us why they were unheeded. There is reason to believe that many of those who changed the government at the last election were taking the first opportunity they had had of pronouncing judgment on those who strolled down the first slopes of the abyss without even realizing they were going downhill.

* * *

WHAT was true in the years before 'the Unnecessary War' is true after it. If the hope of freedom and the good life is to be saved in Europe, it will be done largely from this country, under leaders who are not afraid of their own followers and are the servants not only of a class or group of interests, but of the whole community.

* * *

MR. CHURCHILL'S book is magnificently, if occasionally somewhat 'oratoriously', written. But what a man is here revealed. It is one of the privileges of our time (and in these arid days let us give thanks

for what we can) to have seen greatness in action and heard it in speech.

He anticipates an obvious judgment that this is not history, but only its raw material. But though the future will see the drama in a perspective that is impossible to the actors in it, no generation will know us better than we know ourselves. Historians will relate these events to what happened before and what is to come after, but they will not know how we felt, what mingled hopes and fears and resolution these dire events stirred in our hearts. They will tell of the children, who at the height of the crisis, were sent to America, but will they understand as we do the Eton boy who was so ashamed of being shipped off to Canada, that when he got there, he pretended he had been expelled? They will read about Dunkirk and the miracle of divine grace by which the British army, losing all its equipment, was brought back to re-form, but they will not feel that hush in which the world waited for the fall of London that would have reverberated through history louder than the fall of Constantinople. We may be—we are—short of food and shirts and petrol, but we have *lived*—and some have died—in this unnecessary war.

* * *

MR. CHURCHILL has no words to eat and no speeches to explain away, and he writes with the assurance of one who has ridden the whirlwind. This may not be the whole story of the events it describes, but it is an indispensable part of it. This is the first volume of what will take its place alongside Thucydides and Gibbon, and will have qualities even they have not.

* * *

ONE lesson we will venture to draw. It is simply the fallibility of 'authority'. Government, as is said elsewhere in this issue, is men, sometimes, even in this country, it is one man, and that one man hidden in his office must say yes or no, and sometimes says yes when he ought to say no. A Prime Minister, an Archbishop, a Commander-in-chief may be de-personalized and lifted up above his fellows, yet it is always a man who bears the seals of office, wears the mitre, makes the order of battle, and the day comes when each man's work shall be manifest and tested by fire, whether it be gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble.

* * *

*The Gathering Storm* is the best of the several stories of our times now coming from the presses of England and America. Sir James Grigg, an elementary schoolboy who became Private Secretary to five successive Chancellors of the Exchequer, has written his memoirs under the title *Prejudice and Judgement,* in which he pays a fine and perhaps to some an unexpected tribute to Philip Snowden; B. H. Liddell Hart lets us hear *The German Generals Talk* in captivity, and again shows us that high military

rank can conceal fallible and not very admirable men; Francis Williams, adviser in Public Relations to the Prime Minister, has written in *The Triple Challenge* a number of character sketches of members of the present Government, which are certainly not meant to disparage them; and from America comes *The Private Papers of Harry Hopkins* with a very important account of the history of our own times to supplement and possibly occasionally to correct the unperfect records of our own writers. All these write in something of the dialogue and action of the tremendous drama, whose end is not yet and in which we all have had and still have our various parts. We mention them here not only because of their intrinsic interest, but because they speak to that prevalent condition that seems to want to believe that officials are somehow greater than men, and that if only we organize ourselves into something bigger, it will necessarily be better.

* * *

On the day after Governor Dewey conceded the election for the American Presidency to President Truman, Mr. Alastair Cook, whose American correspondence occasionally brightens the columns of our newspapers, reported that the country was filled with the sound of crunching. Thousands of editors, and journalists, publicists and prognosticators of all kinds were eating their words. (Mr. Cook disposed of his own unpalatable meal in the politest silence possible.) The bookmakers who had been offering odds which rose from 15-1 to 18-1 presumably also made less noise, but needed even robuster digestions as they ate their books. Even our own almost infallible Dr. Brogan was numbered among the discredited prophets. But these newspaper men are tough guys, with gastric juices that an ostrich might envy and, having filled their wastepaper baskets with explanations of what Dewey would do and why, were ready to explain to the world with equal readiness what the President would go on doing. But what will now happen to Dr. Gallup and all his followers, who on the strength of his 'sampling' methods tell us what everybody thinks and wants? Perhaps some of our sociological experts, who reduce men to trends, tendencies and pressures, which can be demonstrated in a graph, will become a trifle more respectful to the spirit which is in man, on which the Spirit which bloweth where it listeth may produce results which do not obey mathematical rules. It is hard enough to discern why men have done what they have done. Let us now agree that it is harder still to tell what they may do.

* * *

One interesting feature of the American election is that the President won in spite of the almost contemptuous hostility of the Press. A similar thing happened in this country, of course, when the present Government was returned. Do newspapers influence opinion? It

is curious that under examination most of the institutions that might be thought to form public opinion protest that they do not lead but follow. It is no secret that Governor Dewey employed Dr. Gallup to take private polls on subjects on which he was about to pronounce with the manner and accent of a leader, and followed his guidance to disaster. If politicians, editors, and even the B.B.C. all have their techniques for keeping their ears to the ground, and tell us that their business is to give people what they want, that they do not call the tune but only supply the harmonies, what are the powers and influences that help us ordinary people to choose the tune? Here, we suggest, is a subject of great importance on which we should all be glad of more light. We ourselves have long cherished the suspicion that the bigger the institution, the party, the circulation, the more careful of itself it must be and the less influential upon opinion it becomes, and that small groups in Churches, Trade Unions, Friendly Societies, the W.E.A. and so forth are more important than appears. A river is fed from many sources on its way to the sea. A better understanding of this truth might help to restore our faith in small Churches, Sunday School classes, Young people's meetings and fellowships, and do something to break down the dangerous and depressing idea that only what is big is good.

* * *

A LESS speculative corrective for the depression that afflicts us when we contemplate the vast forces that seem to be carrying us whither we know not, is provided by Lord Beveridge's new book, *Voluntary Action* (Allen & Unwin, 16s.), a study such as has never been done before of the various forms of voluntary social activity in this country, chiefly during the 19th century. It is the supplement to the author's famous Report on Social Insurance, published in 1942. For sufficient reasons, religious, educational and medical activities are excluded except incidentally, but we hope that this obvious gap will be filled by another volume in due course. A comprehensive and authoritative account of the contribution to the life of the country made under the direct inspiration of the Christian faith might do much to educate a generation that tends to look to physical science to suggest all progressive reform and to the State to carry it through. This book was made possible by the interest of the National Deposit Friendly Society, now much the largest of its kind, which is still based upon a scheme devised 120 years ago by a country clergyman in Hampshire. There is much fascinating detail about these small local societies, whose club night was commonly held at each full moon, 'enabling the brethren with less difficulty to find their way there—and back again after a social evening'. As well as the Friendly Societies, there are of course the Trade Unions, Building Societies, Charitable Trusts and innumerable organizations for the care of children, old people, cripples, the blind, and so on.

Some of these are endeavours in mutual aid, others are more purely philanthropic. Among these latter appear the work of the starred names in English social history. There is an admirable 'Chapter of Pioneers', with an account of Shaftesbury and his predecessors, Elizabeth Fry, Henry Duncan who started the Savings Banks, Thomas Armitage who founded the National Institute for the Blind, Andrew Reed of whom Dr. Peel writes in this issue, Emma Cons who established the Old Vic, Charles Booth, Barnardo, Quintin Hogg. These and many others come alive again in these pages.

* * *

LORD BEVERIDGE includes also a 'Charities Chamber of Horrors', curiosities of charity and the occasional scandals arising from them. A certain Thomas Nash of Bath, for example, provided a bequest to ensure that *muffled* peals of bells should be rung through the whole day on the anniversary of his wedding, and also 'on every anniversary of the day of my decease to ring a grand bob major and merry mirthful peals, *unmuffled,* in joyful commemoration of my happy release from domestic tyranny and wretchedness'. But, poor fellow, he never got his peals.

* * *

OUT of the examination of the changing environment of voluntary action emerges very clearly the permanent need for social service, for the making of a good society depends not on the State but on the citizens. 'My object', says Lord Beveridge, 'is to show how some of these pioneers came to be and to suggest the conditions for ensuring that they have successors. Emphasis on duty rather than assertion of rights presents itself today as the condition on which alone humanity can resume the progress in civilization which has been interrupted by two world wars and remains halted by their consequences'.

* * *

THE kingdom of God cometh not with observation, and we are not to say Lo, here ! or lo, there ! There is an obvious temptation to make the great conferences of 1948 at Amsterdam and in a lesser degree at Lambeth our measure of spiritual influences and powers which do not always express themselves through ecclesiastical organizations. These great assemblies are in part expressions of that deep concern for community in Church and State which is so characteristic of our time. Their real significance will only gradually appear. But of course the Amsterdam Conference was in itself a very remarkable achievement, quite apart from whatever may prove to have been done there. Elsewhere in this issue are included some of the impressions of an eye-witness and two notable contributions, to whose distinguished authors we are much indebted for permission to make them available to our readers, as we are also to the S.C.M. Press, who will shortly publish the Official Report of the Assembly.

The Assembly itself was preceded by four preparatory commissions, whose proceedings are already published in separate volumes, *The Universal Church in God's Design: The Church's Witness to God's Design: The Church and the Disorder of Society: The Church and the International Disorder* (S.C.M. Press, each 12s. 6d.). Each volume includes contributions of individual members of the commissions with an agreed report which was presented to the Assembly. Here is the World Church thinking aloud with courage and candour in the faith that divine grace will be sufficient even for us in 'the sad and ceaseless revolution of our swift and thick coming sorrows'. Together they afford a vivid picture of our time and situation. No analysis of this impressive presentation is possible here, but two papers in the first volume are of fundamental interest, Dr. Visser 't Hooft's estimate of 'The Significance of the World Council of Churches' with a number of comments relating to the kind of authority which may agreeably and rightly be accorded to the World Council, and Professor Skydsgaard's on 'The Roman Catholic Church and the Œcumenical Movement', with a supplementary note by a Roman Catholic writer, Fr. Maurice Villain. At all levels of œcumenical thinking, the problem of authority in the Church is fundamental, and on this we Congregationalists ought to be clear as to the principle which brought us into existence and which it is our responsibility to maintain until we believe its value to be exhausted and its power to have pervaded the life of the world.

* * *

THE report of the *Lambeth Conference 1948* (S.P.C.K., 5s.) was issued before the Amsterdam Conference assembled, and a non-Anglican reader is left wondering whether some of its expressions and attitudes would have been modified at all if the Bishops had met later. In general it would appear that the Church of England has become *the* Church in England and throughout the world. The report of course contains much of interest and value to all Christian people, but there are some things which disappoint those of us who count ourselves Christians and Churchmen (though unworthy), but are nevertheless not Anglicans. To write theology in the light of preconceived ideas seems to us to be dangerously like writing history (and even biological science) in the light of the preconceived dogmas of dialectical materialism. It is difficult to free one's mind from the impression that every situation is met in the light of existing practice, and that the Holy Spirit acts only through one kind of heirarchical ecclesiastical organization. It appears, for example, that the newly-formed Church of South India is only very tentatively acknowledged and similar experiments elsewhere are, to say the least, not encouraged. In another field, freedom from experiment is forbidden. The proposal of the Chinese Church that women should be admitted to the priesthood for an experimental period of twenty

years was rejected. We observe the claim of the Anglican Communion to have a special vocation from God to see that the Church shall be united according to the Anglican pattern, and the Anglican regret that Rome will not acknowledge them except on submission. But they themselves will only recognize other Christians who conform to their heirarchical pattern of Churchmanship. It will be interesting to see whether Amsterdam makes any impression upon this insistence upon conformity to one ecclesiastical form. Is the soul of man to be ground to a fine powder between the upper and nether millstones of political and ecclesiastical authoritarianism? A useful unofficial guide to the report is Canon Dudley Symon's *Lambeth Questions* (S.P.C.K., 2s.).

* * *

St. Paul would no doubt have agreed with St. Chrysostom and Dr. Inge that preaching is like throwing a bucket of water over a row of narrow necked bottles and no less with Anthony Trollope that one can only pour out of a jug what is in it. Nevertheless it was through this foolishness that God was pleased to save them that believed. So he preached wherever he could find hearers. So it has always been, and this foolishness of God has often confounded the wise. Every generation imposes its own technique upon the preacher, but some principles abide. Professor C. F. Rogers, who taught pastoral theology for many years at King's College, London, and for nearly twenty was an indefatigable speaker in Hyde Park, knows most of them. In *The Parson Preaching* (S.P.C.K., 8s.) he gathers together a lifetime's teaching and practice, writing chiefly for Anglican theological students, but with much of great value to say to all who preach. He brings an immense erudition into service, justifying the triple-headed sermon, for example, by quoting the Pythagoreans, who held that the world and all that is in it is determined by the number three, beginning, middle and end. Even before them, Homer had asked, 'What shall I say first? What next? And what last of all?' Professor Rogers emphasizes and illustrates the necessity and efficiency of *continuous* preparation, a mastery of the English language, a respect for English diction and a working agreement between the preacher's tongue and teeth. He exercised his students in tongue-twisters. He is not to be read uncritically. In a book so rich and varied that no young preacher should miss it, it is curious that he ignores the great preachers of the Free Churches, except to dismiss the Yale Lectures as 'all uselessly commonplace', and in a book on preaching it is really perverse to make no reference to the Wesleys except a phrase about the Communion hymns of Charles. Is it because Professor Rogers dislikes expository preaching about which he says nothing? A text for him is always a peg, never a bag. He appreciates the greatness of Welsh hymns, but

says nothing about the great Welsh preachers. Nevertheless, if Professor Rogers won't know us, we are very glad to know his book. But we still think John Bunyan, for example, who had to borrow the only fragment of Latin he writes into his text, must have been a powerful preacher, else why did they put him in prison?

* * *

WE have greatly enjoyed and profitted much from Sir Fred Clarke's little book *Freedom In An Educative Society* (University of London Press, 4s. 6d.) which discusses the educational issues involved in a planned society, where freedom becomes more and more restricted while most men sleep. It is meant chiefly for teachers, but all of us, who as parents, ministers, uncles and aunts have reason to be interested in knowing what kind of education is, or ought to be, shaping the lives of our young people, would do well to read it. Accepting one underlying assumption, it asks the right questions and offers wise and suggestive answers. The assumption is that we know the type of citizen we want to produce and that what we now have to do is to find out how best to do it. (The next stage in all this may very well be the introduction of an official doctrine of genetics, to make the problem so much easier.) Plato was the first to systematize education totally, and he was pushed back to the cradle and beyond. Others like Rousseau and Dr. Arnold have been sure they knew what ought to be wanted. The experts have not always agreed with one another and succeeding generations have rarely failed to find flaws in the plans of their predecessors. Sir Fred is, of course, aware of all this and much more, but feeling compelled to take it as established that we are now an 'educative society', that is "a society which accepts as its overmastering purpose the production of a given type of citizen," sees that the first necessity for our educators is to realize the immense difficulty of the undertaking.

* * *

WHEN General Eisenhower assumed office recently as President of Columbia University he delivered an Inaugural Address. Walking away from the ceremony, one don said to another, "Well, Ike obviously doesn't know one damn thing about education". "Who does?" said the other.

* * *

DR. ELVET LEWIS, C.H., has published a little book of 35 hymns, obtainable from the Bookroom, 7 Northampton Place, Swansea, price 1s. 6d. They have all the beautiful piety, poetic sensibility and skill in versification which always distinguish Dr. Lewis' writing. His occasional hymns already enrich the worship of the Church. Some of these seem to us as good as any he has written—The Good Physician, God's Temple Builders, and The Deeper Peace, among others. They are good, too, for devotional reading.

# "THE WORLD'S DISORDER AND GOD'S DESIGN"[1]

By Karl Barth

We approach our main theme with a background of preparatory work, whose skilful organization deserves our sincere thanks, and whose rich and in every case instructive results deserve our attentive recognition[2].

My task in this opening speech cannot be to develop my own sketch of this theme, nor can it consist in an anticipatory discussion of any one of the groups of questions which confront us. Allow me instead to make a few general observations, which have forced themselves upon me as I have studied the preparatory material. The circle with whose area our four sections have been dealing and will be dealing afresh in these next days has a periphery and a centre. I leave it for you to judge, whether you wish to understand the words I should now like to speak as peripheral comments or as central comments. You will in any case believe me when I say that this is my way of bearing the responsibility which all of us here have taken upon ourselves.

"The world's disorder—and God's design". May I begin by asking you to consider the question whether we must not view and handle this theme, as a whole and in all its aspects, in reverse order. It is written, we should *first* seek God's Kingdom and His righteousness, so that all we need in relation to the world's disorder may be added unto us. Do we not need, do we not want to take this order of topics seriously? God's saving design is above—but the world's disorder, and therefore also our own conceptions of its causes, and therefore also our proposals and plans to combat it, are all *below*. What this whole lower realm (including our own churchly existence !) means, can only—if at all—become clear and understandable to us from above, from the perspective of God's design. Whereas from the world's disorder, and also from our Christian analyses and postulates applied to it, there is no view, no way that leads out and up to God's design. We should not try to begin down below; neither with the unity and disunity of our churches, nor with the good and bad manners of modern man nor with the terrifying picture of a culture which is only technically oriented and only concerned with production, nor with the clash between a godless West

1 An address delivered at the opening session of the first Assembly of the World Council of Churches at Amsterdam and printed here by permission of Dr. Barth and S.C.M. Press.

2 Now available in four volumes (*a*) The Universal Church in God's Design, (*b*) The Church's Witness to God's Design, (*c*) The Church and the Disorder of Society, (*d*) The Church and the International Disorder (S.C.M. Press, each 12s. 6d.).

and a godless East, nor with the threat of the atomic bomb, and certainly not with the few considerations and measures by which we think we might cure all this calamity. In the material that lies before us there speak too many voices laden with repressed care and anxiety, and on the other hand too many voices expressive of all too fond illusions, for us not to need this warning. They are symptomatic of the fact that the question about the right order of procedure, which is from the top downward, is not a question that makes no difference. We are certainly right when we try to put our brother the modern man on his guard against forgetting, in the presence of purely scientific and technical problems and solutions, that he himself is a part of the evil he thinks to overcome in this way; against forgetting that he is not judge but accused; against forgetting that human existence has no meaning without faith in a transcendent truth, goodness and love, which man himself has not created, and by which he can only let himself be bound. But how about the beam in our own eye, at all three of these points, and how could we then help this brother of ours, if we should enter upon and persist in a positivistic way of thinking, which would certainly have nothing to do with the *Christian* realism that is required of us?

But here arises a further question: Should we not also come to the clear understanding that by "God's Design" is really meant *His* plan; that is, His already come, already victorious, already founded *Kingdom* in all its majesty—our Lord *Jesus Christ,* Who has already robbed sin and death, the devil and hell of their power, and already vindicated divine and human justice in His own person? that by "God's Design" is therefore *not* meant the existence of the Church in the world, its task in relation to the world's disorder, its outward and inward activity as an instrument for the amelioration of human life, or finally the result of this activity in the Christianization of all humanity and, connected with this, the setting up of an order of justice and peace embracing our whole planet? that therefore by "God's Design" is *not* meant something like a Christian Marshall Plan?

Through the biblical simile of the Church as the Body of Christ, we have been led to the surely unbiblical habit of speaking as though we had in the Church a continuation of the incarnation of the Word of God. If that were so, then manifestly the Lordship of Jesus Christ on the right hand of the Father, and consequently the power of God's Providence, would have fallen under the sovereign power and administrative control of Christendom; and enslaved mankind would have to look for its salvation from us, from our clear grasp of the world's historical situation, from the progress and actions and the hoped-for future triumphs of the Church, as the embodiment and representative of Jesus Christ and God Himself! Then one easily got in the way of acting as though the Lord on high were dead, as

though there were no independent Wisdom, Righteousness and Goodness, no will and plan of God *Himself*, high *above* all our Christian ecclesiastical life; as though everything took the form of our outlook, our insight and foresight, our Christian endeavour to get right with God and our neighbour. No wonder we get so nervous and fearful when we look at the world's disorder—as Peter looked at the stormy waves in which he was destined shortly to sink.

We can look at all this in quite a different way. The definition of the Church as the Body of Christ is good. But the Body of Christ consists of such means, each in his place, each in his way, as have put their whole hope and trust exclusively in Christ Himself; in His accomplished work of reconciliation on the Cross, in His Resurrection as the sign of the new age which in Him has already broken through, in His Holy Spirit whereby He comforts His tempted community and rules and overrules the world for good, quite differently and far better than we could do—and finally, in His Second Coming in glory, whereby the redemption He has accomplished for the whole creation will be made gloriously manifest. The Body of Christ lives, then, only from Him, through Him and for Him Who is fully present to it, but as its Lord is also entirely above it. I confess that I am frightened at the fact that in all the material before us, while there are incidental reminders of these truths in a rhetorical and theoretical form, there are, so to speak, no practical applications of them. It is as though God's Providence, His already founded Kingdom, the already accomplished reconciliation of the world, the Holy Spirit (whose thoughts are higher than our thoughts!) and even the glorious Second Coming of Jesus Christ and finally the triune God Himself—His person, His purpose, His work, His promise, His power and His glory, lay somewhere outside of the circle we have envisaged under the theme of "Man's Disorder and God's Design" in all our preparatory work! Must we not in this sense begin all over again at every point, if in these coming days all is to go as well as we hope? Surely, we are not ashamed of the Gospel! Else how ashamed of ourselves—which God forbid—we should have to be!

I do not wish to weaken the earnestness, the good will and the hopes that have brought us here, but only to base them on their proper foundation, when I now say: We ought to give up every thought that the care of the Church, the care of the world, is *our* care. Burdened with this thought, we should straighten out nothing, we should only increase disorder in Church and world still more. For just this is the final root and ground of all human disorder; the dreadful, godless, ridiculous opinion that man is the Atlas who is destined to bear the dome of heaven on his shoulders. What we can and ought to do in these days, is simply this: we must give our churches and the world a proof, which we hope will be a

proof "in Spirit and in power", of how it is when a thousand Christians from all lands and peoples, of all tongues and confessions, gathered together in one congregation under present prevailing conditions, stand by what they have so often heard and preached in their several positions and various styles: "Commit thy way unto the Lord and trust in Him, and He will bring it to pass". Must we not stand by that? Are we not children of God? Then why should we not be willing to stand by it, thus giving the proof of the freedom which is bestowed upon us as a congregation of Jesus Christ?

May I make clear by a few examples what sort of spiritual condition I am speaking of, when I speak of this freedom?

(*a*) In our first section[3], we are concerned with the confessional *dividedness* of our churches, and with our hope for some form of *unification* among them. The condition of spiritual freedom now under consideration would consist in this, that we should sit a bit loose in all *our* interests, requests and wishes—confessional and œcumenical alike—and let the One whose name forms the central axis of all our confessions and Who alone has the right and power to call us together and bind us together into His holy universal Church, let *Him* ask us what He thinks of us and wishes for us. Let us make ourselves clear: If we do not listen to Him, then both confessional and œcumenical principles are empty, lifeless, worldly forms, over which to quarrel and over which to agree are equally fruitless. But we may listen to Him. We may let the simple fact have its proper force, that He through His Work and His Word is *our* Lord, and we with our Christian ideas are not *His* Lords. We do not know what will come of it, if we listen to Him. We do not know how our confessional and œcumenical conceptions will withstand the testing fire of His Word. And we ought not to wish to know beforehand. But we may be sure that it can only have a good and wholesome influence upon our desires and ourselves and our churches, to put them and ourselves into this testing fire.

I cannot be entirely silent about a serious *difficulty* into which we have got ourselves in this respect. We are on our way here between a state of division, which is no longer quite complete, and a unity of our churches, which has not yet been fully reached. It would not yet be possible, in the stage we are now going through, for us to have here one common celebration of the Lord's Supper. It will perhaps not be possible for a long time to come. We might properly have made that evident, by celebrating *no* Lord's Supper here. But we may not properly make it evident by celebrating separate Lord Suppers, here of all places. Here we may be an imperfect congregation of the one Lord with heavy but with good consciences. But no blessing and no promise can rest upon us if

[3] "The Universal Church in God's Design".

we now deliberately reject here with one hand what we try to grasp with the other. Now we shall have to win and assert freedom for our one Lord Jesus Christ *in spite of* these divided Lord's Suppers.

May this freedom also mean for us, that we give as little room as possible, in the proceedings of our first Section, to regrets or indignation over the fact that *Rome* and *Moscow* have refused our invitations. Why should we not simply recognize in these refusals the mighty hand of God outstretched over us? He is perhaps giving us a sign in this, by which He will take away from us every illusion that we are capable of building here a tower whose pinnacle will reach to heaven. He is perhaps showing us by this what a miserable light we have been giving forth thus far, since it plainly has not yet been able to shine at all into these other presumably Christian realms. He is perhaps keeping us by this from having partners in discussion in company with whom we could not be a congregation even in an imperfect sense, because they do not fully put their will —although on different grounds—into that movement away from every ecclesiasticism towards Jesus Christ, without which Christians of different origin and different species cannot talk with one another at all, nor listen to one another, still less come into union with one another. And He is perhaps putting us in a very *good* position, precisely in that *Rome* and *Moscow* seem to be deliberately at one in wishing to have nothing to do with us. I propose that we should now praise and thank God, that it pleases Him to stand so clearly in the way of our plans.

(*b*) And now in our second section[4] we are concerned with the question of the Church's *task of proclaiming the Gospel*. A good, a necessary question. How can it leave us any rest? There are in fact so many men who have never yet heard the news of God's accomplished work of grace in Jesus Christ, or have forgotten it again—perhaps because our churches have never yet rightly delivered the message to them. It takes so much prayer and so much labour to make sure that our testimony is no mere pious or moralistic talk, but is really the Gospel of Jesus Christ. And it is such a high art to be as absolutely simple and direct in delivering this testimony as is required by this message. But the only thing that can help us in this matter is a condition of spiritual freedom and joy, resting upon the fact that we have to do with our Lord's already victorious enterprise and not with an enterprise of our own that still strives toward some victory to come. I see right over the material lying before us, strange to say, something like a deep mournful shadow, which seems to arise from the fact that all too many are of the opinion that we Christian men and churchmen must accomplish what only God Himself can bring to pass and what He wills to bring to pass by Himself: this, namely, that men should really come to

[4] "The Church's Witness to God's Design".

faith through really hearing the Gospel. Let us step out from under this mournful shadow! We may be God's witnesses, but He has not called us to be His lawyers, engineers, managers, statisticians, and administrative directors. We are therefore not burdened with the cares that go with *such* activity in His service. Really, how do we come to the fantastic opinion that secularism and godlessness are inventions of *our* time; that there was once a glorious Christian Middle Age with a generally accepted Christian faith, and it is now our task to set up this wonderful state of affairs again in a new form? How do we arrive at the sorry notion of starting our evangelistic approach to modern men by drawing up a tabular view of their wicked axioms: as though we were allowed to regard these worldly people of today from any other standpoint than that Jesus Christ died and rose again for them, and became their divine Brother and Redeemer? How do we come to adopt as self-evident the phrase first used by a German National Socialist, that we are today living in an "unchristian" or even "post-Christian" era—as if we had never yet heard of the delimitation of our time through the Resurrection and Second Coming of Jesus Christ, so as to be impelled to meditate, with this as our deliberately chosen promise, upon the best methods by which evangelization and missions can be carried on in our day? "Post-Christian era?" Nonsense!

But something else might well be asked: What objection could we really make, if it should please God to carry His work onward and reach His goal, *not* through a further numerical increase of so-called Christendom? It seems to me there is no other question for us in this matter than this: How can we free ourselves from all quantitative thinking, all statistics, all calculation of observable consequences, all efforts to achieve a Christian world order, and how can we then shape our witness into a witness to the sovereignty of *God's mercy*, by which alone we can live—a witness to which the Holy Ghost will surely not then refuse to give His confirmation?

(*c*) Finally in our third[5] and fourth[6] sections we shall be busy with the problems of social and international disorder, and the Christian position in the face of these problems. How could it be possible they should not burn and sting us? How could it be right for us to escape them? But I beg permission to put in the remark here, too, that we should meet them in no other condition than in one of spiritual freedom: the condition in which we rely upon God alone and not at all upon men, least of all upon ourselves, or upon the driving power of any sort of Christian undertaking. The world's disorder is in this respect also not less, but not any greater either, than it always was. In the midst of this disorder *to point to God's Kingdom* as the kingdom of justice and peace, is the prophetic

5 "The Church and the Disorder of Society".

6 "The Church and the International Disorder".

task of the Church—the task involved in its office as political watchman and its service as social Samaritan. We cannot be satisfied with the way in which the Church carried on this task in earlier times. Let us see to it that we carry it on better in our time, according to the knowledge that is given to us! Everything here can be reduced to two considerations:

(1) The Kingdom that we show the world must be God's Kingdom and not the kingdom of any sort of ideas and principles that we approve. Let our Yes and No to the activities of industry and the State be the Gospel's Yes and No, and not the Yes and No of any sort of law! We shall not be able to stand upon anything but upon obedience to the concrete commands of the living, present Lord Jesus Christ. We do not therefore have to think about any sort of Christian line of march, but we have to drill ourselves in concrete obedience to this living Lord. Otherwise the possibility could not be excluded, that what we think we ought to show the world under the authority of God's Word, might turn out to be a programme like other programmes, and—who knows—only too closely related to the programmes of particular parties, classes and nations. May one not wonder at the fact that in the third and fourth volumes of our preparatory material, the whole range of problems concerning property, land, rent, capital, interest and money is not even touched upon, let alone discussed and worked upon, as though this territory were *taboo*? Precisely *this* territory, which nevertheless in the New Testament is expressly set under the alternative, "God *or* Mammon!" Perhaps the venerable Fathers of the Moscow Synod or their political advisers meant something of this sort, when they consigned us so ungraciously all in one lump to the "anti-democratic" category. Has the accusation not a bit of truth in it? I fear that from this standpoint we shall be able to meet Communism no worse but also no better than the majority of our Western contemporaries. But I raise this point only to call attention to this: we must be very sure that in carrying out our prophetic task we really point to *God's* kingdom and not in the best of faith to some other kingdom. Otherwise we must not be surprised if our well-meant resolutions do not get the consideration that we think they deserve.

(2) In the second place, we shall have to remember that we can only *point* to God's Kingdom. While we observe our office as political watchmen and do our service as social Samaritans, we wait for the immovable City which God will build—*not* for a future political State to be set up with Christian assistance, whether it be of liberal or authoritarian character. This world passeth away. We have a unique revolutionary hope to proclaim to this world, but we have no system of economic or political principles to offer, which would presume to present, in itself, the content of this hope. There

is no such system, there are only Christian decisions as demonstrations and signs of this hope. For God Himself, and He alone, *is* this hope. What is required of us is that we should be watchful, willing and ready to make such Christian decisions in the midst of an evil world. We are not the ones to change this evil world into a good one. God has not resigned His Lordship over it into our hands. The salvation of the world, which has already been accomplished, was not our work. And so also will that which still remains, the *revealing* of the world's salvation in a new heaven and a new earth, not be our work but His. All that is required of us is that in the midst of the political and social disorder of the world we should be His witnesses, as disciples and servants of Jesus. We shall have plenty for all our hands to do, just being that! "It is *enough* for the disciple that he should be as his Lord, and for the servant that he should be as his Master".

I am at the end, and I must assume when I look at the preparatory material that I have not spoken according to what many of you have in your hearts. Perhaps nevertheless you may have noticed that I have not really wished to dissociate myself from any of the hard labour which has been or will be applied to our theme. I did not wish to tear down but to build up. I did not wish to scatter, but to gather together. I did not wish to say No but to say Yes. Yet according to my view I could only say it in the form of a reminder of the word which the Church as the community of Jesus Christ must always *first* receive as though directed to *itself*: "Take counsel together, and it shall come to nought . . . for God is with us!" (German version: "For here is Immanuel"—*Isaiah* $8^{10}$). According to my view, we need to proceed to our work with a very trustful, but also very sincere, "Lord have mercy upon us!"

# THE CHRISTIAN WITNESS IN THE SOCIAL AND NATIONAL ORDER[1]

By Reinhold Niebuhr

The natural inclination of the convinced Christian when viewing the tragic realities of our contemporary world is to bear witness to the truth in Christ against the secular substitutes for the Christian faith which failed to anticipate and which may have helped to create the tragic world in which we now live. Did they not destroy the sense of a divine sovereignty to which we are all subject? And did they not invent schemes of redemption from evil which made repentance unnecessary?

This inclination may also define our responsibility. But I doubt whether it is our primary responsibility. It is also our opportunity to bring the truth of the Word of God to bear upon the secular roots of our present predicament because our current history is actually a remarkable illustration of the way Nemesis overtakes the pride of man and how divine judgment is visited upon men and nations who exalt themselves above measure.

The liberal part of our culture thought that the Christian idea of the sinfulness of all men was outmoded. In its place it put the idea of a harmless egotism, rendered innocuous either by a prudent self-interest or by a balance of all social forces which would transmute the selfishness of all into a higher social harmony. The vanity of that idea was proved by the ever more dynamic disproportions of power in our society and the ever greater destruction of community in a technical society. Sometimes the liberal part of our culture conceived the idea of redemption through growth and development. Men suffered (so it was argued) not from sin but from impotence. But fortunately the whole historical process was itself redemptive. It translated man from impotence to power, from ignorance to intelligence, from being the victim to becoming the master of historical destiny. This illusion proved as tragic as the first one. Since the sin of man lies in the corruption of his will and not in his weakness, the possibilities of evil grow with the development of the very freedom and power which were supposed to emancipate man.

The obvious illusions of the liberal world prompted a Marxist rebellion against the whole liberal culture. In place of confidence in a simple harmony of all social forces it proclaimed confidence

[1] An address delivered at the First Assembly of the World Council of Churches, Amsterdam, 1948. Here printed by permission of Dr. Niebuhr and S.C.M. Press.

in a new harmony of society through a revolutionary destruction of property, thus making a social institution the root of evil in man and promising redemption through its destruction. In place of the idea of redemption through endless growth and development it promised redemption through the death of an old order and the rise of a new one. But this was not redemption through the perpetual dying to self of the Christian gospel. It was the promise of a new life for us through the death of our foes.

The tragedy of our age has been deepened (1) by the fact that this alternative to secular liberalism proved in many respects even more illusory and erroneous, (2) by the fact that the two forms of error have involved the world in a bitter civil war which rends society asunder from the national to the international community.

It proved even more erroneous because the prophets of this new religion turned into tyrannical priest-kings who, having lost all sense of the contingent character of all human interests and ideas, filled the world with the cruelty of their self-righteousness. It proved more erroneous because the doctrine of the socialization of property, when raised to a doctrine of religious redemption rather than followed pragmatically, merely combines economic and political power in the hands of one oligarchy and produces tyranny. The obvious evils and cruelties of this alternative have given the proponents of the old order good pretexts for not repenting of their own sins but to be content with calling attention to the perils of the alternative.

Perhaps it is because there is a little truth and so much error in both secular alternatives to the Christian faith that they have involved the world in such a hopeless civil war in which each side had enough truth to preserve its sense of high mission and enough error to frighten the other side with the possible consequences of its victory.

We must undoubtedly bear witness against both types of secular illusion from the standpoint of the truth which we have not of ourselves but from the Gospel. In such a witness the contemporary situation offers the Gospel truth a powerful support. We must preach the Gospel in the day in which the modern man, who was so confident that he could control his own destiny, is hopelessly caught in an historic fate in which the human will seems to have become completely impotent and frustrated. The vaunted virtues of each side are vices from the standpoint of the other side and sins in the sight of God. The word of the Psalmist fits our situation exactly: "The heathen have raged and the people have imagined vain things. But he who sitteth in the heavens shall laugh."

But let us not presume to laugh with God. God's derisive

laughter is the justified divine judgment upon this new and yet very old pride of modern man. We must not laugh, lest we forget that His judgment is upon us, as well as upon them. We are too deeply implicated in the disaster of our day to permit ourselves more than provisional testimony against a so-called secular society. That society in both its liberal and Marxist variety came into being, partly because of the deep involvement of Christianity in the social sins of our day and in the stubbornness of the social injustices. A brief catalogue of the sins of the church proves the depth of our involvement. (1) There is no social evil, no form of injustice, whether of the feudal or the capitalist order, which has not been sanctified in some way or other by religious sentiment and thereby rendered more impervious to change. In a sense the word of the modern revolutionist is true: "The beginning of all criticism is the criticism of religion. For it is on this ultimate level that the pretensions of men reach their most absurd form. The final sin is always committed in the name of religion."

(2) A part of the church, fearing involvement in the ambiguities of politics, has declared the problems of politics to be irrelevant to the Christian life. It has abandoned modern men in the perplexities of the modern community and has seen brotherhood destroyed in a technical society without a qualm. Usually this neutrality has not even been honestly neutral. The neutral church is usually an ally of the established social forces.

(3) A part of the church, facing the complexities of the political order, has been content with an insufferable sentimentality. These problems would not arise, it has declared, if only men would love one another. It has insisted that the law of love is a simple possibility when every experience proves that the real problem of our existence lies in the fact that we ought to love one another, but do not. And how do we establish tolerable community in view of the fact that all men, including Christians, are inclined to take advantage of each other? Even now many Christians fatuously hope that this conference will speak some simple moral word which will resolve by love the tragic conflict in the world community. The most opportunistic statesman, who recognizes the complexities which this sentimentality obscures, is a Publican who may enter the Kingdom of God before the Phariseeism which imagines that we can lift ourselves above the tragic moral ambiguities of our existence by a simple act of the will.

(4) A part of the church, conscious of these perplexities, has been ready to elaborate detailed schemes of justice and of law for the regulation of the political and social life of mankind, below the level of love and of grace. But it has involved itself in a graceless and inflexible legalism. It does not know that all law can easily

be the instrument of sin; that inflexible propositions of justice, particularly in the rapidly shifting circumstances of modern technical development, may hinder rather than help the achievement of true justice. One contribution which Christianity certainly ought to make to the problem of political justice is to set all propositions of justice under the law of love, resolving the fruitless debate between pragmatists and legalists and creating the freedom and manœuvrability necessary to achieve a tolerable accord between men and nations in ever more complex human relations. We need a pragmatic attitude toward every institution of property and of government, recognizing that none of them is as sacrosanct as some supposedly Christian or secular system of law has made them, that all of them are subject to corruption and that their abolition is also subject to corruption. This freedom need not degenerate into lawlessness, if it is held in the knowledge that "all things are yours, and ye are Christ's and Christ is God's."

## II

We have spoken negatively. The Christian church must bear witness against every form of pride and vainglory, whether in the secular or in the Christian culture, and be particularly intent upon our own sins, lest we make Christ the judge of the other but not of ourselves. But the experience of repentance does not stand alone. It is a part of a total experience of redemption. Positively our task is to present the Gospel of redemption in Christ to nations as well as to individuals. According to our faith we are always involved in sin and in death because we try too desperately to live, to preserve our pride, to maintain our prestige. Yet it is possible to live truly if we die to self, if the vainglory of man is broken by divine judgment that life may be truly reformed by divine grace. This promise of new life is for individuals; yet who can deny its relevance for nations and empires, for civilizations and cultures also, even though these collective forms of life do not have the exact integrity of the individual soul? nor do they have as direct an access to divine judgment and grace.

The situation in the collective life of mankind today is that we have made shipwreck of our common life through the new powers and freedom which a technical civilization has placed at our disposal. The shipwreck, manifested in the misery and insecurity of the whole world is an objective historical judgment. It is the death which has followed upon a vainglorious life of the nations. Without faith it is nothing but death. Without faith it generates the sorrow of the world, which is despair. Without faith this confusion is the mark of meaninglessness, which follows the destruction of the simple systems of life's meaning which have

had ourselves, our nation and our culture at its centre. It is by faith in the God revealed in One who died and rose again that death can become the basis of new life, that meaninglessness turns into meaning, that judgment is experienced as grace. Our business is so to mediate the divine judgment and grace that nations, classes, states and cultures, as well as individuals, may discern the divine Author of their wounds, that they may also know the possibility of a new and whole life. In a day of complacency and security the Christian Church must anticipate the judgment which is to come and declare that the day of the Lord will be darkness and not light. In the day of judgment and catastrophe the Christian Gospel has a message of hope for those who truly repent.

It is true that the human situation is such that repentance is always required even as evil always flourishes. But it is wrong to preach this gospel *sub specie aeternitatis* as if there were no history with its times and seasons, and with its particular occasions. Nor is our preaching of any avail if we only persuade men and nations to acknowledge the original sin which infects us all but not the particular sins of which we are guilty. Not the least of our tasks is to expound a judgment and a mercy which temper the wind to the shorn sheep. Must we not warn victorious nations that they are wrong in regarding their victory as a proof of their virtue, lest they engulf the world in a new chain of evil by their vindictiveness, which is nothing else than the fury of their self-righteousness. And is our word to the defeated nations not of a different order, reminding them that their warfare is accomplished, seeing that they have received at the Lord's hand double for all their sins, and that the punishment is really at the Lord's hand even though it is not nicely proportioned to the evil committed. Must we not warn powerful and secure nations and classes that they have an idolatrous idea of their own importance, and that as surely as they say "I sit as a queen and shall never know sorrow" so surely shall "in one moment her sorrow come." And must we not remind those who are weak and defrauded and despised that God will avenge the cruelties from which they suffer but will also not bear the cruel resentment which corrupts their hearts. Must we not say to the rich and secure classes of society that their vaunted devotion to the laws and structures of society which guarantee their privileges is tainted with self-interest; and must we not say to the poor that their dream of a propertyless society of perfect justice turns into a nightmare of new injustice because it is based only upon the recognition of the sin which the other commits and knows nothing of the sin which the poor man commits when he is no longer poor but has become a commissar. Everywhere life is delivered unto death because it is ensnared in self-delusion

and practises every evasion rather than meet the true God. And everywhere the Church is caught in this dance of death because it allows the accents of national pride and of racial prejudice, the notes of self-esteem and complacency to colour its message, so that the whole business of religion in our day could seem to the cynical observer (even as it must appear to the righteous God) as a vast effort to lobby in the courts of the Almighty to gain a special advantage for our cause in the divine adjudication. If the slogan that the Church should be the Church is to have a meaning other than its withdrawal from the world, must it not mean that by prayer and fasting it has at least extricated itself in some degree from its embarrassing alliances with this or that class, race and nation so that it may speak the word of God more purely, and more forthrightly to each man and nation, but also to each generation according to the peculiar needs of the person and the hour?

A new life is possible for those who die to the old self, whether nations or individuals, at any time and in any situation. But on the positive side there are also special words to be spoken to an age beside timeless words. The new life, which we require collectively in our age, is a community wide enough to make the world-wide interdependence of nations in a technical age sufferable; and a justice, carefully enough balanced to make the dynamic forces of a technical society yield a tolerable justice, rather than an alternation of intolerable anarchy and intolerable tyranny. To accomplish this purpose some of our own preconceptions must go and the same law of love which is no simple possibility for man or society must be enthroned as yet the final standard of every institution, structure and system of justice. To those who exalt freedom we must declare that freedom without community is not love but leads to man making himself his own end. To those who exalt community we must declare that no historic community deserves the final devotion of man, since his stature and structure are such that only God can be the end of his life. Against those who make the State sacrosanct we must insist that the State is always tempted to set its majesty in rebellious opposition to the divine Majesty. To those who fear the extension of the State for the regulation of modern economic life we must point out that their fears are frequently prompted not by a concern for justice but by a jealous desire to maintain their own power. A tolerable community under modern conditions cannot be easily established; it can be established at all only if much of what has been regarded as absolute is recognized to be relative; and if everywhere men seek to separate the precious from the vile and sharply distinguish between their interests and the demands which God and their neighbour make upon them.

Perhaps it cannot be established at all. Perhaps our generation will fail. Perhaps we lack the humility and charity for the task. There are ominous signs of our possible and even probable failure. There is the promise of a new life for men and nations in the Gospel; but there is no guarantee of historic success. There is no way of transmuting the Christian Gospel into a system of historical optimism. The final victory over man's disorder is God's and not ours; but we do have responsibility for proximate victories. Christian life without a high sense of responsibility for the health of our communities, our nations and our cultures degenerates into an intolerable other-worldliness. We can neither renounce this earthly home of ours nor yet claim that its failures and defeats give the final meaning to our existence.

Jesus wept over Jerusalem and regretted that it did not know the things that belonged to its peace. In the Old Testament we have the touching story of Abraham bargaining with God about the size of the saving remnant which would be needed to redeem the city. Would fifty, or forty, or thirty be required? He and the Lord finally settled for ten. Only a small leaven is needed, only a little centre of health can become the means of convalescence for a whole community. That fact measures the awful responsibility of the people of God in the world's cities of destruction.

But there is a climax in this story which is frequently disregarded. It is a terrible climax which has relevance for our own day. However small the saving remnant which God requires for the reconstruction of our communities it was not forthcoming in Sodom and Gomorrah. One has the uneasy feeling that we are in that position. There is so little health in the whole of our modern civilization that one cannot find the island of order from which to proceed against disorder. Our choices have become terribly circumscribed. Must we finally choose between atomic annihilation or subjection to universal tyranny? If such a day should come, we will remember that the mystery of God's sovereignty and mercy transcends the fate of empires and civilizations. He will be exalted though they perish. However, He does not desire their perdition but rather that they turn from their evil ways and live. From us He demands that we work while it is day, since the night cometh when no man can work.

# "WE INTEND TO STAY TOGETHER"

## SOME COMMENTS ON THE AMSTERDAM ASSEMBLY OF THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

By Cecil Northcott, M.A.

Amsterdam was less an international conference to be reported than an experience to be communicated, and to be entered into. As the event in time recedes so its history becomes part of the continuing presence of the Christian church. Something happened in a Dutch city in the year of grace 1948 which gave fresh direction to the flow of Christian history only yet dimly understood and partially seen. Nobody knows what it all means. That is a judgment for Christian prophets to heed as much as a similar judgment should have been taken to heart by those over-confident gentlemen who predicted that Mr. Dewey would win. Nobody knows, not even those who have been set to guide the new World Council of Churches.

There are, of course, some things that are known about Amsterdam. An assembly of delegates was called from one hundred and forty-seven churches—this figure is open to correction to 135 or 144 according to how you answer the question, "What is a Church?"—and from forty-four countries. This "getting together" would in itself be significant particularly in the fear-ridden atmosphere of the 1948 summer, but it would not be a unique happening. Amsterdam had a long heritage as far as its international setting was concerned, a pure-blooded pedigree stretching back through all the various international eruptions which many Christian organizations have staged during the last eighty years. I feared at one time that its conference pedigree was so impeccable that it would merely be a continuation of that well trodden line of country.

But it proved to have a soul of its own although the portentous apparatus of international gatherings—duplicators, translators, and an avalanche of paper—threatened at times to murder it. Its organization is worth commenting on because the secular observers present were impressed by how these Christians do things, and one distinguished British journalist openly announced that the Assembly was a Christian one because his lost tobacco pouch was returned intact! Amsterdam's soul, however, lies not in the millions of words spoken, or in the endless speeches duplicated and circulated, and now—many of them—printed, but in what it was and what it did.

A lot of what Amsterdam said does not provide fresh guidance either for the world or the Christian church. Did anyone expect it would? The delegates were an average drawing from the resources

of the member churches of the World Council, not endowed with any special insight or wisdom, and reflecting in their speeches the interim judgments and decisions of Christian people everywhere. For instance on war. It did not require an Amsterdam Assembly to reveal the mortal dilemma of Christians everywhere about war and the usage of force. Neither was it necessary to point out the obvious differences between the two orders of society as represented in communism and capitalism. And in speaking to itself about the design and witness of the Church the Assembly only reiterated the theological positions which are commonly taken up. It is possible to go through the Amsterdam sectional reports, in which the real work of the Assembly is collated, and to be disappointed at their lack of originality, careful dullness, and exasperating generalities. All those who wrestled in the sections recognize the inadequacy of the Amsterdam judgments but humbly suggest that they are strictly "of the Church". This is where the Church is—poor in worship and weak in judgment. Amsterdam was an honest, rather matter of fact gathering which did reveal in what it said the misery, born of disunity and fear, of the Christian churches.

Its secret does not lie here. Rather it is in what it was and continues to be. To have said all that was said by an official gathering of Christians from all parts of the world, separated politically, divided theologically, committed to extremely divergent church traditions but with the one over-riding loyalty *in Christ* is an event in history. This is the new thing, the fresh gift of life. What Amsterdam said in words, however, may pass on into the limbo prepared to receive such offerings, but the mind and spirit which thought and spoke are already enriching our common life. This fact was amply illustrated in the combat between East and West which Amsterdam saw in the persons of Mr. Dulles and Mr. Hromadka. They clashed, but the Assembly itself bridged the divide by its strong, inner, given sense of Christian unity which refused to let the two men dwell in separated camps. In other words, Amsterdam was in the present dire conflict but yet above it, and therefore, by demonstrating what it was, held the Christian household together in the "upper room." It is this rebirth of a Christian world sense which may in years to come be regarded as Amsterdam's chief contribution to the œcumenical movement. From being the private enthusiasm of a number of eminent church leaders the œcumenical movement is now living in the light of contemporary history, and has forged for itself a working machine in the World Council of Churches which is not the Great Church to be, nor the œcumenical movement, but the servant of both.

We can easily grow over-lyrical about the œcumenical movement. That is a temptation of secretarial bureaucrats who direct missionary societies, international Christian councils of one sort and another

and of delegates to Amsterdam. But when that snare is avoided and the *acta* of Amsterdam are allowed to speak for themselves, there is a residue of achievement which is both positive and permanent. The formation of the World Council is naturally the main achievement, and the operative phrase connected with it is *We intend to stay together,* a word in the Amsterdam Message which may well be the most historic five words of all the millions spoken at the birth of the World Council. The member churches cannot now turn back and walk alone. This continuous walking and talking they have begun is a process so far only in its infancy, only just entered on by the churches as churches. Nobody knows where it will lead. It will be surprising if it does not lead to close working co-operation in some practical undertakings and eventually even to unity. There are whole reservoirs of risks in this adventure of staying together which will cool the hearts of the ardent, and utterly freeze the cautious. Amsterdam itself was a major risk, and the result of taking it means that even more formidable ones will soon appear. Meanwhile here are some of the immediate effects of this decision to stay together.

*Church isolationism is severely shaken.* After this Assembly no church can live to itself. We realized at Amsterdam how miserably ignorant we are of one another, and how happy we are to dwell in ignorance. We saw that isolationism is a sin religiously as well as politically, and that those who condemn it in countries are almost blithe about it in Christianity. Amsterdam taught many new people to look over the barriers surrounding their own churches, and to recognize the worth of the other man's church. The astonishing variety and richness of the Christian faith in its church life were made apparent. How much has flourished in isolation, and how little is communicated of these riches in Christ to other Christian communions! We cannot go on being contented isolationists.

*Church traditions are up for judgment.* Some Amsterdam delegates no doubt went home convinced more than ever that their church tradition is the only one that really matters. That attitude itself is a recognition of the silent judgment which Amsterdam began. No church in the future can regard itself as the sole container of Christian truth, or imagine that the Christian way it has inherited is the only way. None of the churches is The Church. While Amsterdam avoided trying to build up an artificial synthesis and calling it unity, it set up in delegates' minds a fresh conception of what the Great Church is, the community which transcends the partial manifestations of it as seen in the present churches.

*Everyone looks afresh at his own church.* This experience, however, not only turns towards unity, it also re-emphasizes the worth of a particular confession. That tendency is marked, and partly accounts for the revival of "internationalism" amongst

the confessions at the same time as they together pledge their support to the œcumenical movement. But the strengthening of separate denominational life is not a disservice to the greater whole, for a fresh understanding of what each church is bringing into The Great Church is necessary.

*Amsterdam reinforced the will to union.* The Amsterdam meeting was not concerned primarily about the union of the churches. We were carefully reminded of that fact on almost every occasion, until it became obvious to observers that the one point everyone wished to avoid was the real point of the Assembly. In every section and every committee the fact of disunity coloured discussion. The divided state of Christ's Church was again seen as the cardinal sin of Christian people. Section One says:

> Although we cannot fully meet, Our Lord will not allow us to turn away from one another. We cannot ignore one another, for the very intensity of our difference testifies to a common conviction which we drew from Him. The Body of Christ *is* a unity which makes it impossible for us either to forget each other or to be content with agreement upon isolated parts of our belief whilst we leave the other parts unreconciled.
>
> Yet we have found God in His mercy penetrating the barriers of our fundamental division and enabling us to speak, in the common language of the divine revelation witnessed to in the Scriptures, about the points at which we find we meet. Wherever we find ourselves thus speaking together of our unity, we also find ourselves faced by some stubborn problems.

Well, this has been said before, and it will be said again. The point is that Amsterdam said it and thereby reinforced the will to union.

*A fresh impetus was given to the churches to behave as part of the whole Church.* To quote Section One again:

> Within our divided churches, there is much which we confess with penitence before the Lord of the Church, for it is in our estrangement from Him that all our sin has its origin. It is because of this that the evils of the world have so deeply penetrated our churches, so that amongst us too there are worldly standards of success, class-division, economic rivalry, a secular mind. Even where there are no differences of theology, language, or liturgy, there exist churches segregated by race and colour, a scandal within the Body of Christ. We are in danger of being salt that has lost its savour and is fit for nothing.

Each separated church sees its life, its strength and weakness more clearly when it is in the company of other churches. It is also braced up to its best behaviour in œcumenical conversations, and is less inclined to declare that other confessions are "lesser breeds without the law". But beyond all this the agreement to *stay together* is a discipline of discovery in the mind of Christ about the Church,

and an upholder of standards of truth which the individual church must face. What Congregationalist would disagree with this affirmation which came from a discussion in Section One?

> We believe that the Church has a vocation to worship God in His holiness, to proclaim the Gospel to every creature. She is equipped by God with the various gifts of the Spirit for the building up of the Body of Christ. She has been set apart in holiness to live for the service of all mankind, in faith and love, by the power of the crucified and risen Lord and according to His example. She is composed of forgiven sinners yet partaking already, by faith, in the eternity of the Kingdom of God and waiting for the consummation when Christ shall come again in the fulness of His glory and power.

The discussion then went on to list the three heads of the main differences as they were seen at Amsterdam:

> The relation between the Godward vocation of the Church in worship and her manward vocation in witness and service.
>
> The degree to which the Kingdom of God can be said to be already realized within the Church.
>
> The nature of the Church's responsibility for the common life of men and their temporal institutions.

To find a solution of these disagreements the churches must *stay together* and first of all behave towards one another as true churches who have each discovered a big nugget of the truth. No delegate at Amsterdam can continue to act and speak within his own church as if this Assembly had never happened. He will be tested by his loyalty to the new experience, and his readiness to make the discipline of *staying together* practical in his own national setting. If anyone went to Amsterdam expecting thrills and uplift he must have come away disappointed. The œcumenical movement is not a purveyor of "big occasions" but a continuous infiltration into the separated communions of a spirit of the Great Church, a poor embodiment of the Church's majesty and glory but at least an embodiment.

Now Congregationalists ought to welcome all this with both hands. This movement, to use a popular expression, is "right up their street". They are the historic practitioners of *staying together,* and have proved by their inventions, designs and adventures that it can be done. The World Council itself is Congregational practice writ large—an association of member churches who, while retaining their individual sovereignties intact, agree to work together. I have tried elsewhere[1] to show what Congregationalism may contribute to the whole Church, and I add here some further comments on the Amsterdam experience which can be translated into action both nationally and locally.

*The "gathered church" succession.* Many at Amsterdam saw

[1] *Answer from Amsterdam* (Independent Press, 2s. 6d.).

for the first time the meaning of the apostolic succession through the "gathered church"—the response of faith to the call of the Gospel. We believe as Congregationalists that this succession is as authentic as any other succession from the apostles. It is comprehensive. It does not need episcopacy, for instance, to make it authentic. Dr. Douglas Horton made a gallant attempt at Amsterdam to persuade the Assembly to put the "gathered church" tradition in the same category as "catholic" and "protestant" in describing the three main streams of Christian experience. It was a tactical failure rather than a strategical one, because the Assembly had already made up its mind that "catholic" and "protestant" were inclusive enough to include the variations. But Dr. Horton's point remains, and any discussions about union must proceed from the basis of mutual recognition of apostolic successions rather than from the premise that some are defective and need to repair their defections.

This means for Congregationalists that we act on this belief nationally and locally in relation to other churches, acting towards them as we would be treated.

*Each church must have the will to unite.* Dr. Horton in an address to the Visitors' Conference placed this amongst the marks of the church which should be visible. Can we test our contemporary Congregationalism at this point? Is there any will amongst us towards union? It is not enough to make speeches about the fact of disunion. If we really mean business in the œcumenical movement then this mark of churchmanship should be more evident than it is. It starts in local areas not so much by discussions about union but by certain acts together as the whole Church. For instance, I know of no local area in England where a thorough survey has been made of the Christian resources which can be used for local evangelism. Every now and again an *ad hoc* campaign is planned perhaps by a single church in isolation or co-operatively, but the start is usually from scratch with improvised organization. Can there be more œcumenical life at this point? The resources of a given area in full-time parsons, in specialists in some form of Christian witness who live in the area, in those who can teach, preach, organize ought to be known and registered. Areas should be surveyed for entries into the secular life of industry, the professions and business. Hit and run commando campaigns do not really win a war. Victory originates in the *will* of the Christian churches to be united. It is really not beyond possibility for each local area to have a general staff which shall be the embodiment of the œcumenical movement in action. More local church councils which are really comprehensive are needed everywhere not merely to tell people about what happened at Amsterdam or to get speakers down from London but to be the œcumenical movement in the local setting.

# THE CHURCHES IN EXILE

By Elfan Rees, M.A.

It is not easy to write an article with any authoritative certainty on the general subject of refugees. The problem is so large as almost to defy definition and is, even today, so fluid that this week's flights alter last week's facts.

In 1945, there were some nine million Displaced Persons in Europe. The majority of them—victims of the Nazi policy of forced labour—waited only for victory to return home. In the years that have passed, almost eight millions of them have been either repatriated or resettled. There remain—as the present burden of the International Refugee Organization—the one million who are for various reasons "unwilling or unable" to return home.

Were this the sum of the refugee problem in Europe, it would need no more concern and consideration than it gets. Unfortunately, while the humanitarian agencies of the victorious Powers have been busying themselves with the tasks of repatriation, the political actions of the same Powers have been negating the results. Article XIII of the Potsdam Agreement provided for the expulsion of some three million Sudetendeutsche from Czechoslovakia, of some four million Reichsdeutsche from the areas of East Prussia ceded to Poland, and many thousands more from Hungary and Austria. It seems not to be in the nature of man to see such practices without emulation, and later unilateral action by the countries of the Danube basin has driven out of their borders almost all the so-called Volksdeutsche, the German-speaking descendants of the Saxon and Swabian settlers of the fifteenth century. Even this was not the end, nor is the end in sight. Changes of government in eastern Europe with consequent political persecutions and fear of the police state add their nightly quota to the stream of fugitives. From Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Yugoslavia and, more recently, the Soviet Zone of Germany, there is a constant infiltration of frightened people.

The net result of all this is that despite the repatriation of Hitler's deportees there are not less than fourteen million uprooted and homeless people in Europe today, some twelve millions of whom are of "German ethnic origin" and for that reason excluded from United Nations' care. The refugee problem in Europe is larger today than it was at the end of the war. We have to face a greater and a more insoluble problem than we inherited from Hitler and we have to face it as a problem of our own creation.

Here, in one issue, is a serious obstacle to economic recovery

in Europe, a most dangerous social irritant, and potent political dynamite. It is not proposed, in the compass of this article, to deal with these the major aspects of the refugee problem. There are many other vital aspects of the problem, and that of the work and condition of the Churches in Exile is one which receives far too little consideration.

It may be said of that proportion of the refugees, whose movement, or rejection of repatriation, was a voluntary decision rather than an official expulsion, that they sacrificed freedom from want in order to gain freedom from fear and freedom of religion. How far they have merely exchanged one fear for a lesser one is debatable, but it is beyond question that they have attained freedom of religion.

One of the most remarkable phenomena of the whole refugee picture is the virility of the Churches in Exile, their fine conception of their duty to their people, and the extent to which the latter depend upon them for consolation and leadership and hope for the future. One explanation of this may lie in the fact that such concern as exists for refugees and is expressed through international relief actions is very largely a concern of the faithful for their brethren in the faith. It is significant that, of twenty societies who have operating agreements with the International Refugee Organization, no less than thirteen of them are by definition Protestant, Roman Catholic, or Jewish. It is the Churches who are being looked to for the "assurances" that are pre-requisite to resettlement in the United States, and the Inter-Faith Committee the body most deeply involved in this movement. Finally, the tragic plight of the German refugee and expellee would be intolerably worse were it not for the magnificent work of Hilfswerk, the relief agency of the Evangelical Church in Germany, and of Caritas, the parallel Catholic agency.

But, whether these facts are causes or effects, or both, there is in the Churches in Exile themselves the stuff and substance of survival.

Of the total refugee population in Europe, no more than some 250,000 are Jews. It is generally agreed that about sixty per cent are of the Roman Catholic faith, and the remainder are members of the Protestant or Eastern Orthodox Churches or Konfessionlose. It is these latter groups, comprising almost four million people, who are the special concern and responsibility of the World Council of Churches Refugee Commission. The bulk of the Protestants, probably eighty per cent of them, are Lutherans, and the Lutheran World Federation itself conducts a major relief operation amongst its own folk.

The overwhelming weight of the problem lies in Germany, but it is so large as to make accurate analysis very difficult. The smaller problem in Austria, where there are some six hundred

thousand refugees, is more manageable analytically and can quite fairly be taken as an epitome of the whole.

The Senior Field Officer in Austria of the World Council of Churches' Refugee Commission, Mr. J. B. Atkinson, has recently completed a survey of the refugee churches now in that country and the facts that follow are culled from his report.

The Eastern Orthodox Church, comprehending Russian, Serbian, and Rumanian pastorates but excluding adherents to the Moscow Patriarchate, serves about eleven thousand souls. They are organized in thirty-three parishes and served by fifty-eight priests, many of whom travelled into exile with large groups of their own people. These churches have a sustained programme of religious teaching and are very largely responsible for the maintenance of eight elementary and four secondary schools.

The Ukrainian Orthodox Church is organized in three parishes served by four priests. The Ukrainian Autocephalic Church is organized into five parishes which are served by nine priests. These two churches between them care for some six thousand Ukrainian refugees.

The Hungarian Evangelical Churches provide a notable example of co-operation in difficulties. Five Reformed and two Lutheran pastors have shared out the territory in parishes and work under one administration. They serve about four thousand adherents. The Latvian Lutheran Church has two well-defined parishes in which about one thousand Latvians are conveniently concentrated. There is one pastor in each parish.

The Esthonian Lutheran Church, while very largely represented in Germany, has less than two hundred members in Austria. There is no resident pastor, but confirmation services are taken by a visiting pastor from one of the parishes in Germany.

The Church of the Czech Brethren is one of the latest to appear in exile. Not yet in any sense a static group or institution, its one centre is primarily a place of counsel and consolation for a small but regular stream of fugitives moving further westwards.

By and large, the foregoing pattern of "Ausländer" churches is repeated on an infinitely larger scale in Germany. The main additional groups, not found in Austria, are Slavic Baptists, Latvian Baptists, some Methodists and, at least as an example of Christian tolerance, a group of Kalmuk Buddhists who have been taken under the wing of the Orthodox Bishop Anastasie!

The World Council of Churches Refugee Commission labours to meet the more urgent needs of these transplanted churches. It is impossible in one article to describe the Commission's work in the fields of Welfare and Resettlement, but its primary task is definedly "the provision of a Christian ministry" to refugees.

Its resources are woefully inadequate, and were it not for the sacrificial giving of the refugee church members themselves and the self-denying devotion of their priests and pastors the whole structure of the Churches in Exile would have collapsed. It is perhaps true to say that hitherto the churches have maintained their own ministry and the Commission has equipped and sustained it. The provision of hymn books and literature, communion sets and wine, vestments, candles and incense may seem a small approach to a major problem but it has proved to be no less important to the recipients than the bicycle for the pastor and the extra food and travelling expenses for Church conferences and Synod meetings.

The increased unemployment and the desperate poverty of the refugees following currency reforms are now posing much more serious problems of support. Congregational offerings have become impossible and it has already proved necessary for the Commission to provide grants for church administration and for pastoral maintenance. Unless these can be continued and indeed increased in 1949 a major collapse of this ministry is unavoidable. An estimate of the cost of maintaining the work of the exiled churches in Austria for next year indicates that this great and vital service can be carried on if £15,000 is available to subsidize it.

So far attention has been concentrated on the Ausländer, on the national Churches existing in exile. The problem of the spiritual care of the German refugee, be he Volksdeutsche or Reichsdeutsche, is more homogeneous although infinitely larger in size. The burden has fallen upon and has been most gallantly shouldered by the native churches of Germany and Austria. How they have done it is an epic that merits and requires separate recital. It has become abundantly clear, however, since the currency reforms and their astonishing failure to make special provision for church funds, that this work cannot be maintained in the next few years without substantial outside assistance. Snapshots are inadequate as illustrations of this problem, but it may emphasize the difficulties involved to give just two. Bavaria is predominantly Catholic, but thousands of Sudeten Protestants have been dumped there with little or no parish machinery to care for them. The Protestants of the main parish of Salzburg have been increased from six thousand to fourteen thousand by the influx of Volksdeutsche refugees.

The exclusive inhospitableness of the world makes it likely, and economic and social factors may make it desirable, that the main solution of the German refugee problem must be that of absorption and occupational adjustment. If this is achieved, it will result, *inter alia,* in a major accession of strength to the Evangelical Churches of Austria and of western Germany.

The way of achievement is, however, long and arduous, and

meanwhile a potential strength is an actual burden. For some years to come the German and Austrian churches will need, not only the prayers and sympathy of their brethren elsewhere, but their very practical and material aid.

The problem of the Ausländer is a quite different one for which there must be an equally different solution. They themselves regard their country of present residence as a temporary asylum. They have no wish to be there, they have no affinity with its culture, and they know how easily they can outstay their already grudging welcome. One of the most distinguished heads of a Church in Exile has defined his people's hopes in these words: "We pray that we may some day return to our own land. If that is impossible we ask that we may be resettled, as a community, in Western Europe. If that too is impossible, let us settle, all together, overseas". To return home, to reform these broken communities elsewhere in Western Europe, or to emigrate; these are clearly the only possibilities. Moreover, short of a war which would leave few to return and less to return to, the first alternative is not a practical reality. There has been some substantial resettlement in Western Europe notably in Sweden, France and Great Britain, but saturation point is being reached long before the problem is solved. It is now becoming generally recognized that overseas emigration is the only real hope.

This raises issues which are of vital importance to both the Churches in Exile and those who help them. What is their future? The refugees always plead for settlement in community; receiving countries on the other hand emphasize the importance of assimilation, and the two points of view are difficult to reconcile. There is likely to be permanent opposition to the establishment of enclaves of nostalgic ethnic groups in new countries, and it seems most likely that the process of selection and resettlement will create a diaspora which will, from the start, be impossible to serve and, in a short time, difficult to identify. At the moment the vitality of the Churches in Exile depends upon the inspiration of trusted leaders consecrated to their calling in freer days by laws now abrogated, upon the convenient ethnic grouping of the refugees and upon outside help. The former will pass away, and resettlement will break up the grouping: what then must be the policy of outside helpers? It needs also to be remembered that there are certain dangers to which these churches are in varying degrees peculiarly susceptible. The only national institution that the refugees brought with them was their church, and for this reason the church tends to become the rallying point not only of faith but of patriotism as well. There is always present the danger that the church may become political and national rather than theological and confessional.

These are problems for tomorrow and there is no ready answer

to them. The Refugee Commission has already decided as a principle that the responsibility for the spiritual care of refugees resettled lies with the churches of the receiving countries. Much excellent work is already being done, particularly by the British Council of Churches and by the Joint Committee of Reformed and Lutheran Churches in France. There is, however, no possibility of one pattern. In countries where confession matches confession there should be no insuperable difficulties. Thus in the United States it should be as easy for an Esthonian Lutheran to become American and remain Lutheran as for a Hungarian Calvinist to feel at home in the Presbyterian or Evangelical and Reformed Church. The situation in other countries does not provide such natural affinities, in particular the problem of the various Orthodox Churches is difficult almost everywhere. Must not new wine be put into new bottles, or are the denominational patterns of the old world to be transplanted slavishly to the new?

It has been emphasized that these are problems of the future. While they are being resolved, the immediate survival of these Churches is vital. The refugee problem is tragically slow in solution; it would be even more tragic if, while men waited, the Refugee Churches were not there with them as towers of strength and consolation.

# REFLECTIONS ON THE LIFE OF WILLIAM TEMPLE

By Geoffrey F. Nuttall, M.A., D.D.

When a great man dies, his biography seems a poor compensation. Yet a good biography is a great compensation, especially to those who have known and admired him only from a distance. The English-speaking world is immeasurably indebted to the Dean of Lichfield for his biography[1] of his old friend and companion-in-arms, William Temple. The Dean has borne it in mind that "in dealing with the career of an Archbishop of Canterbury, the biographer cannot avoid making some contribution to Church history"; but in portraying the public figure he has never allowed himself to lose the man. As Temple's life became increasingly filled with speeches, committees and causes, the temptation must have been great for his biography to be made inhuman. It is not the least of Dr. Iremonger's services, in conveying Temple's spirit and in carrying on his influence, that his writing never strays far from the reverent study of personality.

He has been helped in this by his bold rejection of a purely chronological order. The framework retains a temporal sequence —Rugby, Balliol, Queen's, the W.E.A., Repton, St. James', Piccadilly, the "Life and Liberty" movement, Westminster, Manchester, York, Canterbury—with Copec, the Prayer Book controversy, the Oecumenical movement, the Malvern Conference and other outstanding subjects appearing (more or less) where one would expect them. But where, in studying any of these phases of interests of Temple's life, the Dean has found light in a letter or pronouncement from another period, he has not hesitated to introduce it. Such a method was undoubtedly made the easier by the clear lines of Temple's life, which was marked by strong continuity and coherence. There is a lovely story of the future philosopher's complaining at the age of eight that, in "The Cat sat on the Mat," "It does not say *which* cat"! And his handwriting changed little in fifty years.

Temple was the first Archbishop of Canterbury to be the son of an Archbishop of Canterbury. Frederick Temple died when his son was still an undergraduate; but his influence on him "is beyond compute." Dr. Iremonger even asks, in seeking to understand why Temple went to Repton—the only sphere where there was

1 *William Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury: His Life and Letters.* By F. A. Iremonger. Oxford University Press. 25s. xv + 663 pp.

no resounding success—"Is it possible that he had an almost superstitious reverence not only for the Archbishop's character and example, but even for the sequence of stages in his father's career?"—for Frederick Temple had been Headmaster of Rugby. William decided to be an archbishop like his father, "in the nursery"! There is a further parallel in their lives in the devotion of each of them to his mother. Frederick Temple's mother, who was left a widow when he was still a boy, lived with him always, nor was it till after her death that he married, at the age of 54. William Temple wrote, and heard from, his mother *daily* when he was at Rugby; when an undergraduate, he walked arm in arm round Oxford with her, and "That needed some doing in those days"; he had her with, or near, him wherever he lived; nor did he, either, marry until after her death. Besides this close relation with his parents and the advantage—as students of genius consider it—of an elderly father, all but 60 at his birth, there was a contrast in Temple's heredity so striking as to be worth noting. His mother was a grand-daughter of the sixth Earl of Carlisle (with all her family's rabid teetotalism). His father's mother was a plain Cornishwoman.

Whatever the home and hereditary influence, it is clear that from his childhood Temple was brilliant, one who in mental activity found the breath of life and was marked out for future leadership. At Rugby he could do two hours' prep. in half an hour, and he "read the whole of 7 English poets" in the time gained. "I think *anything*[2] is possible to him", wrote the Headmaster in his latest report. At Balliol his work was comfortably alpha, and "all were agreed that . . . whatever career he adopted, nothing could keep him from the top of it." This pre-eminence he owed in part to his exceptional memory. From his father he inherited the photographic memory which retains perfectly, and permanently, what has been read. He could also, when dictating, "break off in the middle of a sentence in a complicated letter with the utmost tranquillity and proceed ten minutes later from the exact point where he had left off", and indeed "would be careful" to adopt this procedure if interrupted when writing a book; and once, when at a public address "the shorthand writer failed to appear, he dictated the address a week later walking up and down in his room, without a note."

He also all his life used odd moments as faithfully as any pupil of Samuel Smiles. At 17 he read Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* in a boat on holiday in the Lakes, while the others were fishing or rowing. Bosanquet's *Logic* he read on a three-legged stool in his lodgings at the Oxford Medical Mission in Bermondsey. Croce's *Philosophy of History* he would take for the train. Equally,

[2] The Headmaster's italics.

he would write articles in railway-station waiting-rooms, and work in odd half-hours at his devotional or philosophical writing—not always with the best effect: Professor Dorothy Emmet, who contributes a chapter on Temple as philosopher, says frankly that his *Mens Creatrix* "is a curiously disjointed book." The ability to behave in this way demands an unusual power of detachment, which Temple evidently possessed. He could sleep at any time in the train, and hardly ever lay awake at night.

All this indicates exceptional powers of concentration and endurance, and exceptional control of those powers. Certainly one outstanding character of his life is his steadfast, unwavering purposiveness and assurance. Before he became Bishop of Manchester he spent a number of short periods in a variety of avocations; yet never did a great figure sail more surely and serenely over the sea of life. Even at Rugby "he had a sort of quiet purpose that was recognized." He was not 19 when he wrote to a friend, "I have been determined to be ordained longer than I can remember." Six years later he wrote revealingly, "I emphatically say that a man who has no serious purpose as the backbone of his life cannot be a Christian."

"My interpretation of Subject as primarily Will," as he wrote of his Christological contribution to *Foundations,* though couched in philosophical terms, points clearly to the source of his own purposiveness. It was in the adoring effort to bring his own will into line with the Will of God that he gained the fixity of purpose which nothing could shake. "I have never known what it is to doubt the existence of God," he once confessed. Philosophically, this was a drawback. "His writing leaves the impression," Miss Emmet complains, "that he is never very seriously puzzled." But religiously it enabled him, like Newman, to speak with the conviction which commands a hearing. "Sure of God and of God's universe as he was from the beginning . . . he grew, as a result, to be sure of himself."

"And that goes a long way in Lancashire." These words follow the words "sure of himself" in another context. Was Temple's assurance altogether founded on faith in the Unseen? Or was it flecked at least with something earthier, with what Carlyle called (in the very different case of George Fox) an "enormous sacred self-confidence," based on the consciousness, which he could not help having, of ability and soaring achievement? As an undergraduate he carried the "self-confident, even cocksure" air of Balliol. At times he was misled by his "gift of ready and lucid speech," his tutor noted, "to think that he had found a solution, when he had found a phrase." There is a similar suggestion in the question of Bishop Brilioth "whether Temple's extraordinary ability did not carry with it a certain lack of depth in his thinking."

Something of a parallel to this is to be detected in his emotional life. Again and again in discussing moral questions, "he took his stand firmly on certain Christian principles, the first and greatest of which was the sacredness of personality" (Miss Emmet, indeed, holds that his interpretation of moral obligations is "too exclusively personalist"); and on one occasion he wrote, "I suppose that no sermon preached to a crowd ever did much good. . . . Good spiritual work is done on[3] one person or a dozen people at a time." Yet, though "never shy with children," "he lacked facility for small talk with strangers"; at Repton he admitted he would feel more comfortable "if only he could always address individual parents or boys as if they were a public meeting"; when preaching, "he gave the impression of thinking more of the message he had come to deliver than of the people to whom he was giving it"; and he defended a cope as "curiously effective in obliterating the sense of individuality in the wearer" (though earlier "he preferred not to wear vestments"). When he became engaged to be married, "You have seemed so strong and *αὐτάρκης*," wrote a friend, "one wondered whether you were independent of these things." To the end, says his biographer, he "remained inappropriable," seeming to many "a man without close friends." This is as much as to suggest a certain lack of depth here also.

In reading his life, in fact, one is from time to time brought up against something which cannot be called superficiality and yet which fails to reach beneath the upper levels down to the fountains of the spirit. Intellectually, part of the price paid for his brilliance was that he was so consciously conscious. While allowing that "all my decisive thinking goes on behind the scenes," he had all his generation's antipathy to, almost unbelief in, the subconscious. There is no evocative dreaminess about the expression of his thought, all is clear and clear cut. And in the emotional sphere the reader feels, as Dr. Iremonger says his contemporaries felt, that "the note of tragedy was missing from Temple's life, that he had never been 'up against it'." The element of struggle seems strangely lacking.

But is this last judgment true? It needs qualifying. If tragedy, *la fertilisante douleur,* was a stranger to Temple, he knew at least the weariness of ill-health and the trial to faith which acute pain can bring. In all his reading "he read entirely through one eye" and "always read slowly"; and all his life his activities were hindered by this poor sight. All his life, also, he was "very susceptible to heat" and prone to hay fever. Moreover, he had a "thorn in the flesh" which attacked him first when he was two, and finally (though it was not the immediate cause) killed him: gout. It rarely left him for long and sometimes attacked him

[3] Note *on,* not *to.*

with (in a characteristic phrase) "prodigious violence." Against this torturing and inhibiting complaint his life *was* one long struggle. But "he never lost heart."

There was also one moment, if only one, when Temple received a slap in the face; and it was an occasion which affected the deepest places of his life. We have seen his early "determination" to be ordained. "I had hoped to do useful work as a parson, and thought my gifts(!)[4] peculiarly suited to that kind of work." His only doubt was whether his acceptance of the Church's "formulae would be so deceptive as to be impossible." At the age of 24 he sought ordination from the Bishop of Oxford, stating his belief that "the helping men to reach the living Presence of Christ is the noblest work in the world." The Bishop refused to ordain him—on the ground that Temple could accept the Virgin Birth only "very tentatively" and the Physical Resurrection "with rather more confidence." This must have been a turning-point in Temple's life. His sense of a Divine call to the ministry was evidently not strong enough to counter the Bishop's refusal: he was too loyal an Anglican for that. Within two years the Archbishop of Canterbury, whom Temple described *at the time* as "the essence of kindness and sanity—without a glimmer of inspiration," found him "*in all essential particulars*[5], an orthodox believer" in both doctrines; and he was accordingly ordained. In respect of the Virgin Birth, his biographer states that Temple later "experienced absolute certitude of its truth—at a second of time during a symphony concert at the Queen's Hall." One may make what one will of this: for "mystical" content it stands alone; but one has no right to question Temple's sincerity. One may, however, wonder what would have happened had he not become "an orthodox believer," and had he continued to feel as he wrote after the Bishop had refused him: "The Church must be purged, I think, from without . . . More and more I come to regard 'Churchiness' as a sign of the useless . . . If the Church turns one out one must go on outside."

One may also imagine the caustic comment he would have made on words which, as it worked out, in 1942 Temple was to write himself: "I shall be surprised if just at this moment the 'powers' select me for Canterbury. Some of my recent utterances have not been liked in political circles . . . ." "The 'powers' . . . political circles"! Long before this, as, frankly and sorrowfully, his biographer notes, the question of disestablishment, which in their "Life and Liberty" movement had loomed so large in the eyes of both of them, for Temple had "ceased to be a moral issue." As early as 1925 he had pronounced it a question "in which the

[4] Temple's exclamation mark.
[5] Davidson's italics.

Church need take no interest at all." In this matter "Temple made no attempt to disguise the complete *bouleversement* of his earlier convictions." Dr. Iremonger's feelings appear in his placing in this context (without date) a phrase from a letter in which Temple wrote, "I often wonder, sometimes with real torment of mind and soul, whether I have not been turning my back on the light." This is the one occasion on which Temple permits us to see a tiny puncture in his otherwise unfailing self-confidence. To Free Churchmen the context of disestablishment provided by Dr. Iremonger is less unimportant than it will be to most of his Anglican readers. We are left to wonder whether the original context was a wider one.

If depth in Temple's character is sometimes open to question, the breadth of his humanity is never in doubt. One of the many excellencies of this biography is that it tells the little personal things. "In later life cats were among his favourite companions." Browning was his favourite poet; Botticelli his favourite painter; *Lear* his favourite Shakespeare play, though Hamlet his favourite character; *Karamazov* "the greatest novel"; *Emma* his favourite Jane Austen. We also see him reading *Winnie-the-Pooh* and reading *Alice* aloud; Bradshaw's *Timetable* was "one of his favourite books." He read the *Republic* "eight times in his life" and thought himself probably the only English clergyman who had read Aquinas' *Summa* from cover to cover. Spinoza (read at Jena) "is the greatest of all of them—there!" We learn which were his favourite *Psalms* (103, 23, 104, 107, 139 were the first five) and some of his favourite hymns. "With St. John I am at home." We are told his specially loved holiday places at home and abroad. "For cricket he had neither taste nor talent," but "Eternally hopeful, he nearly always brought a tennis racket" to conferences. "Before 1937 he had only seen two films in his life." "He knew the names of no racehorses." "He was a non-smoker and a teetotaller." We are also treated to a number of pen-pictures such as "I thought old Lord Halifax would shake to pieces in his rage at what I said" or "Laski amuses me. He dislikes the Church intensely, and his net is spread too visibly in the sight of the birds." All these touches, and many more, fill out the picture of the man and help us to know him with an intimacy which would have been possible to few before his death.

To sum up, the spiritual quality which was God's gift to us in Temple would seem to have had two main aspects. In the first place, he held fast to the roots of religion in experience. Of religion he said that "in its essence it is an experience . . . an experience of the power of the love of God in Christ changing our hopes and desires." He believed in "the real and objective presence of our Lord in the sacramental elements," but evidently not only

there. "I am entirely convinced that prayer is the chief thing," he said more than once, and his people at Manchester he asked to "pray for me chiefly that I may never let go of the unseen hand of the Lord Jesus and may live in daily fellowship with Him." From this daily fellowship came the serenity which overcame his physical ailments and torments, came the stillness even of body as he stood preaching, an "atmosphere of stillness and peace (which yet seemed charged with power) that pervaded" even his study.

Secondly, he was unwearying and fearless in relating religious experience and conviction to ordered thought. A prime influence here was Edward Caird, and Dr. Iremonger justly applies to Temple words written of Caird: "Nothing could content him but to be a man of coherent convictions." Of one of his own books Temple wrote that he sought to show that "Epistemology, Aesthetic, Ethico-politics, and Philosophy of Religion are moving on converging lines." Metaphysics, sociology, economics, whatever it might be, were all to be related to fundamental Christian principles and to find their point of unity and ultimate intelligibility in the Incarnation. He spent his life in showing a sceptical and scornful generation that it is possible to be a Christian and still to be enlightened. For the increase of late in serious-mindedness among thoughtful people the war has been largely responsible, but Temple hardly less so. Where, one wonders, would he have led us next? To what new line of thinking would he have turned to break fresh ground? "I think I shall write a book about the Holy Spirit," he said to his wife a month or two before he died; "I have always wanted to have a try at that."

# THE CONGREGATIONAL IDEAL OF FREEDOM IN THE SOCIALIST STATE

By The Editor

There are many definitions of Socialism, and, if not many kinds of Socialism, a great many varying degrees of socialization in different countries at the same time and in the same country at different times. For the purposes of this discussion we take socialism to mean the assumption by the State of such powers of control over its subjects as are deemed necessary to protect and further the interests of the whole.

It is clear that for the State—any State—to exist at all, it must assume certain powers and deny them to individuals or parties or corporations or unions or societies within itself. In a civilized State in normal times these powers are willingly accorded by the overwhelming majority of its subjects. The life of the State is, however, no more static than is the life of the individual, and in the course of the inevitable changes and developments in both communities and individuals tension arises. The question is always being asked what powers are to be maintained or assumed by the State and what left to private decision, and there is no final answer. The State takes to itself with general agreement the necessary powers to preserve internal peace and control foreign relations. But even in these fundamental concerns, where agreement in principle is easiest, problems arise. In this country, for example, every citizen is required to give help to preserve law and order and deny aid and comfort to criminals, so maintaining the King's peace, and no one questions it. But if the foreign policy of the government involves military conscription, some people object, pleading the more fundamental rights of the individual conscience. In our present situation, some would not fight at all, others would fight against Spain but not against Russia, while others would fight against Russia but not against Spain, that is, they reserve the right to submit the powers of the State to the judgment of individual conscience or even in extreme cases individual political conviction.

It has just been said that no one questions the right and indeed the duty of the State to preserve its own internal peace. Yet it was precisely the acquiescence of the German people in the government of their own country under Hitler that is the ground of our complaint against them. We say they ought to have

rebelled while they were yet only the victims of tyranny and before they became its instruments. We have indeed proceeded against certain German citizens and soldiers with the utmost rigour for offences against laws which, though unstated, were for the purposes of trial and judgment held to override the authority of the German State. Certainly Cromwell and the Independents of the 17th century believed it to be their duty as well as their right to rebel. "If I did not believe this business to be God's, I would long since have been quit of it".

Thus at the very beginning of our enquiry we are involved in profound and profoundly difficult questions as to the relationship of the State and the individuals who compose it. All that we can say at this stage is that neither the power of the State nor the freedom of the individual is absolute. There is and always has been tension, and the lines of demarcation are continually changing.

Consider another living and practical issue. In this country, until quite recently, the attitude of the State towards the education of its children has been to insist upon universal education up to a certain standard, beyond which parents, churches, and societies could carry on along any lines which pleased them in private schools, public schools, theological and technical colleges of many kinds and Universities. And much that is valuable and characteristic in English life has sprung from this freedom. Nowadays the State is assuming the power to direct the whole education of its children and young citizens. Partly this is due to the laudable desire to extend and improve education, but it is clear that the State is assuming the power to decide not only the amount but the kind of education that will henceforth be available. So far in this country, the advantages outweigh the disadvantages, but should we be equally ready to applaud the same growing power in Russia and in Spain?

Observe how with the increase of the power of the State some values and virtues must be examined afresh. There is the question of the toleration of minority opinions. We pride ourselves on our toleration. We owe much in every way to the immense variety of our national life. "It takes all sorts to make a world" we say when we have to comment on our eccentrics. The freedom we demand we are, on the whole, willing to accord. But it has often been pointed out that we as a people can afford to be tolerant because we are fundamentally united and in times of stress are willing to sink our differences. We even tolerated pacifist opinions during the recent wars and awarded exemption from national service to anyone who could satisfy a non-military tribunal of his integrity. But such pacifists were a small minority who could be disregarded. Supposing they became a considerable minority

at any time—would toleration then be easy or indeed possible? We have, in 1948, actually reached the point where, in the opinion of the Government, the toleration of Communists in the Civil Service has become dangerous to stability. But what becomes of us, who are what we are, if we have to deny toleration?

We Christians, to say nothing of ourselves as Free Churchmen, are a minority in the world. By what reasoning can we set limits to our tolerance and yet claim the right to Christian propaganda in India, where there are six million Christians in a land of 370 millions, or in China, which is largely atheist and may become communist before it is Christian?

Plato, Hobbes, Hegel—these mighty intellects have explored and scrutinized these issues and decided that in the interests of security and justice the power of the State must be absolute. They have been answered of course, but they make a formidable case. If we reject it, we must have firm ground beneath us. Nor is it conceivable that it can be rejected altogether. The most contumacious nonconformist does not and cannot live in a vacuum. We are members one of another.

Let us here interpose one consideration which cannot be left implicit. The power that regulates the social conduct of men will inevitably seek to regulate the sources and springs of conduct. Matthew Arnold said that conduct was three-fourths of life, which may be true enough as a quantitive judgment, but it is the remaining one-fourth that decides the character and direction of the whole. Conduct arises out of conviction. In the end what men do is determined by what they think and believe. Communism is of all social systems most concerned with the conduct of men and affairs, but it has been driven to devise a philosophy, which if it were not being used to underpin a vast and powerful social order, would not be worth attention. But on the sound principle that we ought to know what we disagree with, the outlines of dialectical materialism ought to be more familiar to us. *For when principles emerge into action we Churches and Ministers are nothing.* Our part of the battle has been won or lost before action begins. We are concerned with what men are and think and believe, not with what they do. It has been said that the most important branch of science today is anthropology. That is true not only today but every day. The question is indeed, What is man? . . . the temporary lodger in a wholly material universe, or the child of God, made in His image out of the dust of the earth because God breathed into his nostrils the breath of His own life? Are there any Crown Rights of the Redeemer? . . . are there indeed any Crown Rights of the Creator?

So over against Plato, Hobbes and Hegel—and all totalitarians, dialectical materialists and socialist planners—we set, not the

libertarian philosophers, but the New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Now there is no real doubt about where the New Testament lays the emphasis. It is on the soul of man, created by God and redeemed by Jesus Christ, not in coagulated masses, but one by one, and sent into this material world of wonder and terror and beauty to win for himself a place in the company of heaven. That provides the ultimate test of all things whatsoever, that they provide the opportunity for man to make himself fit for immortality. We are not now debating the question of faith and works. We do not believe and we need not believe that an ordinary man is left to lift himself into heaven by his own shoestrings. But we are saying that this world, like a school, is the place and the opportunity for men, one by one, to find their way into the kingdom of God.

Some of us have in these latter days been increasingly uncomfortable about that analogy used so powerfully by the Apostle Paul, "As the body is one and hath many members and all the members of the body, being many, are one body, so also is Christ . . ." It suggests profound truth, but a truth which may be dangerously misleading when it is not balanced by an even deeper truth. No one of course lives in a vacuum. We are a family, the members of which are not less individual but more highly developed individuals because we are members one of another. But the meaning of the family is that it serves its individual members, just as a church exists to serve the individual souls who compose it, though that nurture in part consists in providing the opportunity for service and self-sacrifice. Christ saved the world by dying for it. He identified Himself with the least among His brethren, but He did not lose His identity in them or in the world He saved by His death. His sacrifice made Jesus into Christ. The world, society, mankind was His environment and its need His opportunity. So the social environment of every man is his opportunity, that is its function in relationship to him. It will support him, but that does not mean he will batten on it, exploit it selfishly. He will find his highest life in its service, but the ultimate value is not society, not any society, neither State nor Church, but the individual soul.

We cannot, of course, see ourselves as God sees us, but it is not irreverent to try. Consider, say, the ancient Egyptian civilization, now long since passed away. What is finally important about it? The life of the State?—its culture, its works of art, its discoveries in science or agriculture or any such thing? These may be the things that interest us—but God? Go and wander through the Egyptian Rooms of the British Museum and look at those anonymous mummies, displayed in varying stages of their funerary attire, and let the splendour of the Christian Gospel blind

your astonished eyes as Saul of Tarsus was blinded on the Damascus road. For these ancient, desiccated corpses were once the local habitations of men and women made in the image of God. There is the mummy of a child there—a child like those that Jesus loved and blessed. . . . In the books, in the museums, yes, if you like, in the history of the world, there is something called Egypt, but in the eternal presence of God there are just men and women and little children clothed in their immortality. So we may read the New Testament to say that the community, the Church, the State, are each and all of them parts of the environment of the human soul. They take their meaning from that fact.

This is not the whole meaning of community, but it is fundamental.

It does not mean that the individual has merely to open his hand and his mouth for the State or the Church to fill them with good things. There is, of course, a multiplicity of service which State and Church and all the other forms of community, of which every man is part, do for us. They build up the richness of our life. They keep us reasonably secure and safe in a dangerous and uncertain world, give us our language and our history, adjust and control our relationships with one another, and in return they demand service from us. We, who are kept safe, must keep others safe; we who receive a tradition, must hand it on; we, who have learned, must teach; maybe we, who have been fought for, must fight, certainly we, who have been paid for, must pay. Service is asked for, even, it may be, sacrifice, but in that toil and sweat and blood we find ourselves, justify our existence and make ourselves fit and able to receive the gift of immortality. In losing our life we find it. But that simply is not true if immortality is not true, as we realize afresh on every Remembrance Sunday, when Pomp and Circumstance pay tribute to Sacrifice.

The present fashion of thought—it may be no more than a temporary phase, a sociological "new look"—is less concerned with the meaning and destiny of Mansoul—it is difficult to think of a Pilgrim's Progress being written, or even much read, today—than with the varying patterns of mankind in the mass. We need not enquire into the reasons for this overwhelming preoccupation. In part it arises from the immense pressure of increasing populations—during the last century the population of the world has doubled—demanding higher material standards of living, stimulated by the attainments and still more the promises of recent scientific discoveries, and the spread of information. Here for example is Dr. J. B. S. Haldane in a moment of intoxication in which we all share in part. . . . "If Science is permitted to take things in hand, no bounds can be set to human progress. Disease will be

abolished. Men will be able to think like Newton, to write like Racine, to paint like the Van Eycks, to compose like Bach. They will be as incapable of hatred as St. Francis. Man's life will be measured by thousands of years and every moment of his life will be lived with the passion of a lover or a discoverer".

Well, it may be, and well indeed if it be. But as Macneille Dixon, from whom I borrow the quotation, comments, [1]"Reflect for a moment upon what this programme leaves out. Justice for one thing. Would you in possession of this heaven upon earth be content to forget the past sufferings of human kind? Would a happy lot for men and women to be some day born compensate for all that the previous generations have endured? Do not these humanitarian schemes overlook with singular inhumanity the millions who have perished without even a glimpse of the glories to come? Yet what have these newcomers done to deserve the felicity denied their predecessors and will they be of any greater account when their day, too, has come? . . .

> O dreadful thought, if all our sires and we
> Are but foundations of a race to be,—
> Stones which one thrusts in earth and builds thereon
> A white delight, a Parian Parthenon,
> And thither, long thereafter, youth and maid
> Seek with glad brows the alabaster shade,
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Not caring that those mighty columns rest
> Each on the ruin of a human breast,—
> That to the shrine the victor's chariot rolls
> Across the anguish of ten thousand souls".

Even if this prospective Utopia satisfies us, what sort of God is it who thus uses ten thousand times ten thousand of His own children as the foundation stones of an edifice of material felicity, which surely He could have brought into being by a word? He who said, Let there be light, and there was light, could no less have said, Let there be felicity and there would be felicity. No, if your God is to be efficiency, find first an efficient God. But don't waste time looking for Him in the New Testament. In the end, it is not Community in any of its forms, neither State, nor Country nor Church, nor any of the fashionable abstractions of the moment that is the final good, but the men who compose them. And this is true not only *sub specie aeternitatis* but in present actual fact. When we talk of "the Church" deciding or believing or doing something, or "the Board of Education" or "the Ministry of Food" or "the Foreign Office", or "Russia" or "France" or "Western Europe" or "the East", what do we mean? We mean *men*, for only men can think and believe and do. It is true

[1] Macneille Dixon: *The Human Situation* (Arnold, pp. 188, 189).

men may be required to think and act with official responsibility and on behalf of one another, but it is men who interpret that responsibility. Even a Trades Union or a Missionary Society or a Government really means a man, or men, guided, helped, supported, protected, and maybe concealed by other men, but always men.

When therefore we speak of the State claiming absolute power over its subjects, we mean some men claiming absolute power over other men. It is men who are born and die, who work think, will and feel, who love and hate and eat and drink. It is men who bear the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune. It is Tom, Dick and Harry, Mary, Jane and Martha who have bodies to be hurt and souls to be won or lost. If you ask what distinguishes Man in the whole creation, it is that each man is himself and not another. That is not to deny that we are like one another, with similar needs and enjoyments. But you cannot enjoy a sunset for your dearest friend nor is your hunger for the Bread of Life assuaged when he has eaten. However many men there are or have been or ever will be, each is himself.

Now Christianity sets the seal of eternal truth upon this fact of universal experience and insists that we do not run away from it when the burden of our sins is too great for us or the responsibility is too heavy. When we would hide in a crowd or an office or a society, Christianity reminds us that we are members of the family of God and so are they with whom we deal. From this truth all else springs. If it be not true, we are all, presently, eternally dead men and Christ has died in vain.

But just because this is true it is sometimes said—Let religion confine itself to its concern for man's eternal destiny and leave to politics and economics and sociology his well-being here and now. That was the argument used by Hitler at the stage before he was ready to deal finally with the Christian Church. (We know now from the published diaries of Goebbels that National Socialism, having won the war and established itself as the only power in Europe, had marked down the Christian Church for complete destruction). But thus to separate man's hereafter from his present life is to deny the continuity of God's purpose and His sovereignty over this material part of His creation. If this world is God's creation and we are His children temporarily inhabiting this one of his many mansions, this life is as much a part of His purpose for us as the hereafter, His writ runs and our present responsibility is to Him.

So we come to the crucial fact of individual responsibility to God, out of which comes the necessity for individual freedom. Only as we are free can we be responsible. A man can be compelled to do good. He cannot be compelled to be good. If

the important thing is to do right things, let us choose, if we can find him, some sufficiently wise man, some philosopher king, to tell us what to do. But if the important thing is that we, being what we are, should learn to become good, then we must each do his own sums, even though it is certain we shall get some of them wrong. If God wants an efficiently run world, why does He not run it through the agency of instinct-driven, robot men? But if He would gather about Him a family of loving children, not all of them always infants in arms, then He and we must accept the tremendous risks of human freedom. It is only when we think of the risks God is prepared to take, the patience He is prepared to exercise, the price He is prepared to pay, that the importance of man's freedom begins to emerge. Freedom is not the indulgence of passing whims and the refusal of discipline. It is the necessary condition for the agonizing effort of creation. As the artist must be free in the exercise of his creative art, so must we be free in the creative art of the Christian life. Freedom is not a privilege or even a right. It is part of the burden of life.

Congregationalism is the expression, in the organization of Christian fellowship, of this lofty doctrine of responsibility and freedom. We are not mere schismatics, or contumacious nonconformists. We are Free Church Men. We exercise no authority upon one another. We accept and use the influence of the Holy Spirit as it manifests itself in us and through us.

We do not need to be reminded that we have this treasure in earthen vessels. We have less patience with one another than God has with us all. Our difficulties are many and our temptations are strong. The free association of free men, unequal in everything except their freedom in Christ, will never be easy and rarely efficient, and so many of us crave after order and unification and are nearly always so certain we are right that it can easily appear to be a moral duty to compel others to agree with us. But if, like Kant and the Greek philosophers before him, we contemplate the endless variety of God's creation and the inexhaustible variety of human nature, we may come to care less for organizations that seek to absorb all men into themselves. Tyranny is a hateful thing whether exercised by a Dictator or a Bishop or a committee. It breeds arrogance in him who uses it and defaces the image of God in him who is used by it. How often have good men stumbled here. They have called upon God to rend the heavens and come down. But alas for us, for whom the end would always justify the means, God continues to make His sun to rise on the evil and the good and to send His rain on the just and the unjust. He for ever overcomes evil with good.

If, greatly daring, we venture to spell out the meaning of this inexhaustible, benevolent patience, its message seems to say that

God is less interested in efficient production than in the effect of productive work upon the workers. If the important thing is that the answers to life's questions should be right, why does not God, who knows them already, reveal them simply and painlessly to us. But if the important thing is that we should learn to use our powers of mind and soul until in the mercy of God we are fit for the company of heaven, then indeed we must do our own sums. It is not only children who learn from their mistakes.

"But the waste!" you say. "To what purpose is this waste?" And who shall answer? What is waste?—that a box of alabaster ointment, very precious, should be poured out upon the Master's head?—that He himself should die upon the Cross at 33?—that young men should die before they have begun to live to preserve the hope of freedom in the world?—that Britain should impoverish herself in two great wars to beat down tyranny? Is it waste to spend one's life trying to teach the freedom of the faith to men who seem to prefer security? These are hard questions, which each must answer for himself.

Our function as Christians is to accept and preach the Gospel of Christ. We are Congregationalists because we believe that individual responsibility and liberty are part of the conditions prerequisite to the Christian life. Where these conditions are yet to be won, or being won, are in danger of being lost, our duty is plain. How far in specific circumstances we must prefer security and efficiency, we will not here presume to pronounce. But the balance will be preserved only if our fundamental convictions are unshakeable. This is often understood better by the enemies of freedom than its friends. They have offered the kingdoms of this world to those who will surrender that freedom. But there are those who cannot fit this conception of the happy slave into the vision of the New Jerusalem.

# ANDREW REED

## "A LIFE—WITH DEEDS TO CROWN IT"

By Albert Peel, M.A., Litt.D.

When a young Congregationalist recently asked me who was the greatest Congregationalist in the nineteenth century my suspicions bristled, as they always do at the approach of a superlative. The answer, of course, depends largely on the answerer, for it is largely a matter of taste and training. The ecclesiastic would probably plump for one of the great administrators—architects of the Congregational Union of England and Wales like its great secretaries, Algernon Wells and Alexander Hannay. Theologians would think of Fairbairn or of Dale, preachers of Joseph Parker and James Parsons, politicians of Miall and Richard, missionaries of Moffat and Livingstone, pastors of Macfadyen and John Angell James.

The question would quickly arise whether a man's influence exercised directly on individuals by preacher or pastor is as deep and as lasting as that exercised through books or institutions. Does the man who speaks only to a congregation, even if his work be multiplied by his hearers, count for as much in the long run as the man whose books, poems, hymns, are read generation after generation? If a man can in his life play many parts, may it not be that in the aggregate his total contribution to mankind out-tops that of those who do one thing only? Take two examples of men who in no field of activity were pre-eminent but who in several were at least very good second classes. Henry Allon was a pastor and preacher who built up a great church; he was the editor of a quarterly journal which was widely read by thinking people; he made contributions to the worship of the Church which were of great significance. George Barrett had a ministry in Norwich the force of which is not yet spent: he was the unmitred "Bishop of East Anglia"; he was largely responsible for the new Constitution of the Congregational Union and could have been that Union's Secretary; he edited a *Hymnal* which for thirty years was in general use in Congregational Churches. The influence of these men in any one field of their activity was considerable; in all fields together it is perhaps beyond measurement.

If to services like these a man adds the foundation of institutions of great and lasting benefit to mankind, so that the good he does lives after him, may he not deserve a superlative? It was with

such thoughts in mind that I asked my young friend to consider the claims of Andrew Reed.

For once a memorial tablet neither lies nor exaggerates. Here is what the church to which Reed ministered for fifty years—first in the New Road Chapel in St. George's-in-the-East and then in Wycliffe Chapel—said of their "beloved and faithful pastor":

> The Rev. Andrew Reed, D.D.
> at the age of twenty-four years was ordained as pastor of this church, and for the long period of over half a century maintained the oversight of it in the Lord with pre-eminent ability and devotedness.
> As a minister,
> he preached Christ crucified, and, following closely in the footsteps of the Saviour, he lived, laboured and prayed for the salvation of his hearers, and was signally honoured as an instrument in turning many to righteousness.
> As a man,
> he lived in the world to bless it; being the founder of six of our noblest institutions, for the relief of the fatherless, the idiot, and the incurably afflicted, he bequeathed to his country a worthy legacy and an imperishable monument.

Andrew Reed's father and five brothers were "the six six-foot Reeds", who went forth from Maiden Newton to preach and were largely responsible for the foundation of an Independent congregation there. Andrew, Senior, made his way to London to follow his craft as a watch-maker, met his wife while engaged on sick visitation, and with her established a home which in itself explains their son's devotion. So keen was the wife that her husband should use his gifts in the preaching of the Gospel that she opened a china shop to maintain the family and allow her husband to pursue his studies. This enabled him to give twenty years' gratuitous service to the London Itinerant Society and to the "Congregational Society for spreading the Gospel in the dark places of England", which in 1803 became the Village Itinerating Society.

Religion dominated the life of the home; the young boy heard of the formation of the London Missionary Society and of the Religious Tract Society. He was taken to Bunhill Fields to see the resting-place of many noted Nonconformists and to St. Paul's Cathedral to see the newly-erected statue of John Howard. Hymns and prayers were often heard in the home, and the growing youth frequently refers to these devotional gatherings. Thus, when he enters College in 1807, he writes:

> On Good Friday my parents had a meeting for the purpose of prayer and praise; praise for the Lord's goodness manifested to them through the last seven years, and prayer for the Lord's

> peculiar blessing upon me, as preparing for the work of the ministry. The Rev. Dr. Winter and other friends were present. I hope to reap unspeakable advantage from these prayers.

Already he had given himself much to prayer and study, and Watts's *Advice to a Young Man* and his *Improvement of the Mind*, and Alleine's *Alarm to Unconverted Sinners*, had influenced him. He attended some of Matthew Wilks's classes and tried to master the Assembly's Catechism; he began Sunday School teaching and with other teachers formed "the Society of Contending Brethren".

One great influence in his life was that of his minister, Samuel Lyndall, and he joined the church at New Road at the age of 18. Like Watts before him, he was given the chance to go to one of the older Universities, with the same result, and in 1807 he entered Hackney College. His powers as a preacher were speedily recognized, and whenever he conducted services—it was the custom for students to take several Sundays in one church—he was pressed to undertake the pastorate. Selby, Bristol, Lancaster, Cheltenham, Dublin, Plymouth, Jewin Street (London) and even the Tabernacle itself, were eager to secure the young preacher as minister. He decided to accept an invitation to succeed his own minister, and was ordained at New Road, then a church of 60 members, on the 27th November, 1811, the anniversary of which was celebrated by the congregation for fifty years[1]. Within three years the membership had trebled, in seven years 354 members were added, and the chapel—it seated 800—was filled at each service.

This brief article cannot pretend even to summarize the activities of Reed's life and ministry. Only the outstanding features can be noted in passing. One of them is his constant habit of self-examination, the recognition of defects in his own character and ministry, and the constant summoning of himself and his congregation to more urgent prayer[2]. Another is his attitude to money. He rejoiced when his salary was doubled in his early years because it would enable him to help people in need, resolving with his wife at the same time

> not to lay by a shilling of my salary, to live as economically as is suitable to our station and character, and to devote the surplus to objects of benevolence.

When the new chapel was built he determined never to take more than his then stipend, not merely so that his disinterestedness might appear, but that the church might have a surplus to help other causes. Here are his words—and they show the spirit then moving those who were working for the formation of a Congregational Union:

[1] Nearly a hundred ministers and students were present at the ordination.

[2] Readers of the *Life of R. F. Horton* will often be reminded of Horton as they study the ministry of Andrew Reed.

> I think our Independent churches are *too independent*. If they flourish within themselves, they are too often content. Many of them will, perhaps, rejoice to know that others prosper likewise; but they have not entered on any regular method to nourish weak congregations, or to plant new ones. In many instances, if a minister fully adapted to the work could be comfortably sustained two or three years, a weak church, instead of being a doubtful good, or perhaps even a positive evil, would rise into true independency, respectability, and usefulness. . . . How happy I shall be if we realize a surplus of £200 a year for such or other worthy purposes.

This explains why Reed was not only able to serve the great institutions he founded without taking any remuneration, and to contribute largely to their support, but also to give—as it seems to us, lavishly—to churches as he travelled up and down the country. This sense of stewardship and constant generosity proved of the greatest help when money had to be sought—and Reed was always seeking it: members of the Royal family and of the nobility, city magnates and well-to-do ministers and congregations, could not refuse a man who never spared himself. Even the £500 the church gave him at the jubilee service went at once "to the fatherless".

An officer in one of the asylums noted how carefully and scrupulously Reed avoided—

> all charges for personal expenses—even paying the postage of his own letters. However long he may have been engaged at the office (and I have been with him as late as ten at night) he never had refreshment at the Society's expense; nor did he ever allow the Board to reimburse him the cost of his daily private conveyance from and to his own house.

We smaller men who deem a pastorate of ten years lengthy, marvel how men like Andrew Reed could do so much. For fifty years he maintained the ministry of a great church. There was never a church meeting without the admission of new members, sometimes scores at a time; 128 were received in 1834; by 1844 2,500 had been received altogether. Four-fifths of the membership of 1,100 would be present at the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and 120 of the congregation were able to engage in public prayer. Yet the minister was never exalted overmuch, nor thought that of himself he had done these things. The sense of responsibility, the consciousness of half-hearted service, never left him. In the year that he estimated he had received 2,500 members in all, he comments:

1. I have done almost nothing.
2. My time is short.
3. There is much to be done in my church and neighbourhood.
4. Some 500 yet to be converted.

5. My active people need to be renewed.
6. Many of the pious young need a second conversion to raise them to eminent piety.
7. Religion is lesser, I think around me, and in the churches of the Metropolis, than it was five years ago. When all is cold about us, we must take care not to catch cold.

It has already been suggested that the secret of the success of Reed's ministry is not to be found in the fact that he concentrated his efforts on his own congregation alone. He was in journeyings oft, and nobody seems to have appealed to him in vain for help. And with this well-named Andrew it was never a question of a speedy visit, the preaching of two eloquent "travellers", the acceptance of a few guineas, and an immediate departure. There was always the building of a new chapel or something similar to be discussed, causes to be started, and money provided for them. In one tour, when he travelled 1,500 miles and "opened six new chapels," he visited Carlisle, where a new chapel was mooted:

> Present sixteen friends, but with little heart to give. Three men offered five pounds! Never saw anything weaker. All agreed that a new chapel was wanted. We resolved to try. Visited some leading men in the town, and soon saw our way to nearly £1,000. Left the people resolved to have a chapel in 1841, to cost not less than £2,000, and to hold 1,000 people. Could I but spare a month in seeking the revival of religion here! Nothing is wanted so much as three or four of our active men, wholly or partially engaged to move over the land, to uphold the ministers, revive the life of the churches, and arrest the attention of the world.

There is no room to tell of Reed's activity in the fields of education and ecclesiastical controversy, of temptations to become a missionary of the L.M.S. or of the newly-formed Colonial Missionary Society, or of the visit he and James Matheson, representing the Congregational Union, paid to the American Churches in 1834[3]. Nor can we describe Reed's venture into the realm of fiction or his work as hymn-writer, though we should never sing, "Spirit divine! attend our prayers", without a thought of its writer.

It is as philanthropist rather than as divine that Reed will be held in lasting remembrance. At an early age he was deeply moved by the plight of fatherless children, and for them and for those afflicted in mind and in body he spent himself, counting no service too great. One after another institution was started, Reed not only raising most of the money for them and stimulating enthusiasm, but supervising the building and equipment, and then taking a lion's share in the management. No sooner was the

[3] See *A Narrative of the Visit to the American Churches*, by the Deputation. . . . 2 vols. 1834.

London Orphan Asylum (started 1813 in Clapton) functioning than plans were made for an Infant Orphan Asylum (Wanstead, 1827). Then came the New Asylum (1884, Stamford Hill, then Reedham), the Asylum for Idiots (a word which has gone out of use today) at Highgate, subsequently Earlswood, Redhill, 1846, and Colchester, and the Royal Hospital for Incurables (1854). Any one of these might have taxed the capacities of a man with abundant leisure, but Reed started and served them all with unceasing devotion while still minister at Wycliffe. He must have had not only an orderly mind and the ability to make one task a recreation to another, but he was clearly a master alike of policy and of detail—few things escaped his attention. History must record with regret that sectarian bigotry caused his withdrawal from his beloved Wanstead. For long the agreement that no distinctive catechism should be taught was loyally observed, but in 1843 a majority insisted that the Church of England catechism should be used, and there was no option for Reed but to resign. It was this action which led to the establishment of the "New Asylum", now Reedham Orphanage, but nothing diminished the founder's affection for Wanstead. But the experience was a painful one, and it left a wound which never really healed. Reed's justification was in noble terms:

> For sixteen years the Asylum at Wanstead was open to the child of the poor widow: now it is closed to the child of the widowed Nonconformist, except upon condition of his learning the Catechism of the Church of England. We must commit the crime, when help is refused from others, of helping ourselves. We will bear the wrong, but we will not be driven from our duty or our principles. I have confidence that those who have contended meekly and firmly for liberal things, will do so again, come what may; and, whatever others may do, let us be resolved not to carry uncharitableness into the work of charity.

An attempt was made by Reed's sons and biographers to tabulate his service to the benevolent foundations for which he was responsible. Such services defy tabulation, but here are some of the salient figures.

*London Orphan Asylum.* 401 inmates, 2,757 total admissions, £407,000 total receipts, served by Reed 33 years, during which he contributed £480.

*Infant Orphan Asylum.* 597 inmates, 1,918 total admissions, £303,000 total receipts, served 16 years, contributed £260.

*Reedham.* 177; 468; £63,000; 18 years; £1,800.

*Earlswood.* 350; 920; £210,000; 15 years; £1,400.

*Incurables.* 159; 258; £44,000; 8 years; £300.

*Eastern Counties.* 76; 102; £17,000; £200 *plus* £50 *p.a.*

To all these institutions which were functioning when Reed made his will in 1851 (the Hospital for Incurables was not then started) Reed made bequests, some of them revealing, such as that "to provide playthings for the children" at Wanstead to be given them at Christmas. His thoughtfulness appears throughout. Thus, fifty poor members of his church are to receive a guinea each, "such as are most likely to feel the event, and *at once*, as otherwise they may distress themselves in trying to make some appearance at my funeral". Again he asks the Boards

> that, while they may choose to regulate the religious teaching by a catechism generally, they provide that no catechism shall be *imposed* on any child, but that the judgment of its friends be taken and sacredly observed; and that the institution be open to all destitute orphans, without respect to sex, creed, place, or country.

The last clause reads:

> Finally—I bequeath the Four Asylums to my beloved country, with an earnest prayer that they may be watched over with wisdom and benevolence; that they may be kept free from abuse; preserved in efficiency; and remain, age after age, memorials of that Divine charity which exalteth and glorifieth a people.

At the beginning of this paper I quoted the Wycliffe congregation's tribute to its pastor. Here is that pastor's tombstone for himself written for his son—"to my saucy boy, who said he would write my life and asked for materials":

A.R.
I was born yesterday:
I shall die tomorrow:
And I must not spend today
in telling what I have done,
but in doing what I may for
Him
Who has done all for me.

---

I sprang from the people; I have lived for the people—
The most for the unhappy;
And the people, when they shall hear it,
Will not allow me to die out of their loving remembrance.

And of all the people Congregationalists certainly should not[4].

[4] Those who want to know more of Reed should turn to the admirable biography by his sons (1863), Andrew, also a Congregational minister, and Charles (afterwards Sir Charles, M.P., Chairman of the London School Board, and deacon of Clapton Park Congregational Church).

# WHY EUROPEAN UNION?

By R. W. G. Mackay, M.P.

The United States of Europe is an urgent necessity for political and economic reasons. Politically, unity can come to Europe through its conquest by one power, or by agreement among the different States. France and Germany have at one time or another tried to conquer Europe. A United States of Europe would make it possible for the German, the French, the British and the Italian to live together in peace. While political reasons were more important before the war, the economic ones are looming larger today. In the hundred years between the Battle of Waterloo and the Battle of Gallipoli, the States of Europe, particularly those of western Europe, increased their prosperity and standard of living only by sending some thirty millions of their population overseas, by supplying the territories overseas with capital and equipment and by exchanging manufactured consumption goods for raw materials and foodstuffs supplied from overseas. And the process was assisted by Britain, who acted both as bankers and policemen and provided a large part of the merchant navy. None of these conditions has been present since the first world war.

With the development in Europe and elsewhere of economic nationalism world trade in manufactured goods has gone down, though trade in foodstuffs and raw materials has increased. Britain's place in the world has been taken by the United States, who, not dependant on the importation of foodstuffs and raw materials as Britain was, and with a large free trade market of her own, is unable to provide those services for the other nations of the world—banker, lender, conveyor, buyer—on which world trade depends. With Free Trade and Protection both out of date, prosperity in the twentieth century is for those countries who have a large trading area, like the United States and the Soviet Union. In the economic sense European States have all shrunk in size. They are no longer the great Powers that they were. Thus it becomes necessary that they should unite together in one large trading area, so that their industry should have markets large enough to survive and stand up to competition from other similar trading areas.

The second world war showed how hollow was the economic independence of the European states. While imports to Europe from America have increased in 1947 over what they were in 1938, the inter-State trade of Europe in 1947 is only half of what it was in 1938. Furthermore, German exports to Europe, on which the whole

of the European economy was based in pre-war days, are not one-third of what they were in 1938; and Britain, who normally was a large importer from Europe, has had to buy from America most of the imports she requires. All of this results from fear of German industrial recovery, from the present barriers to trade due to customs, quotas and the many different currencies in Europe, all of which prevent the full and proper development of European trade. Belgium has surplus steel, but the other countries of Europe lack the currency to buy it. Britain has a surplus of textiles but Sweden cannot buy them because of import licences and shortage of currency. The transport of Europe is seriously deficient, but the barges on the Rhine and in Holland cannot be put to general European use. Italy is over-produced in vegetables and other foodstuffs which the other countries of Europe cannot buy. The European Recovery Programme provides for the manufacture of rolling stock which could be made in Sweden or in Italy or in Britain, but if it were made in these three countries, none of the other countries of Europe could buy it. Turkey and Greece have a surplus of tobacco, which again the European countries are buying from America. Italy and France before the war produced more wheat than Canada, which today they are not producing, so that we must buy more wheat from America under the European Recovery Programme.

This list of economic anomalies could be continued *ad infinitum*. But what is to be done? What steps must be taken so that trade in Europe can move as freely as it does in the U.S.A.? If the currency problem is to be solved there must be a European Minister of Finance who can create a European note issue, a European currency and a European bank; and those three steps can be taken only by a European government. This means a European Parliament and legislation to create the bank and note issue. The agricultural development of Europe, the solution of the wheat problem, the improvement of dairy production in different countries, etc., will be determined only when there is a Minister for Agriculture with power to insist on production levels in different countries and with power to withhold grants from those States which do not bring their production up to a certain level. The same is true of transport, of industrial production and everything else. The appointment of a Minister of Customs who could within six months introduce one customs tariff for Europe as a whole and bring to an end all the import barriers between the different states of Europe, would in itself stimulate inter-State trade enormously. Nothing short of a Government with power will be able to do what is necessary. A large amount of planning for Europe has to be carried out in agriculture, in coal, in steel, in industrial production and in transport. Whichever problem you look at, steps have to be taken by one authority, which will be distasteful to some of the States of Europe.

The prosperity of the United States comes primarily not from her large resources or the intelligence of her population, but from her large markets. Europe has comparable resources if her twenty-five States are taken as one area. There is plenty of skill in the European population of 275 million people. If there were a common currency—a European guilder, dollar or franc—instead of the seventeen or twenty-five currencies which exist today, trade in Europe would be much freer and would inevitably increase. Likewise, if the import barriers, quotas and customs duties were removed from the individual States, trade could flow freely from the North of Scotland to Scandinavia and the South of Italy and to Greece and Turkey.

These are the considerations which demand the union of Europe. The Marshall plan promises aid to Europe for a period of four years, but each year the grant must be renewed. Without it Europe simply cannot recover, but the question we have to ask ourselves is, will the period of recovery be used by the European States to create a political and economic organization which will make further aid unnecessary? The Congressmen in the United States who were hostile to the European Recovery Programme have accepted it on the assumption that the States of Europe would create a federation such as they know in their own country. If these assumptions prove false, E.R.P. will come to an end. Thus, not only do conditions in Europe demand union, but, in effect, the conditions of the European Recovery Programme demand it, and there is no time to lose.

### *The Functional Approach*

There are two main ways of approach to European Union. Some suggest a European Parliament with power; others favour the creation of *ad hoc* bodies to co-operate in different economic activities out of which, it is hoped, some political organization will develop. This latter is a functional approach and may be regarded as the policy of the British Government. It is reflected in the Brussels Pact, which was made primarily on the initiative of Mr. Ernest Bevin, and the Paris Agreement for O.E.E.C.[1] which resulted from the initiative of Mr. Marshall. No one with a knowledge of the facts will consider that the Brussels Pact and the Council which it has created will be anything else than a military alliance concerned with considerations of defence. But while defence may be one of the benefits which accrue from European Union, it cannot be the main aim. The prosperity and wellbeing of the European peoples and the development of their resources are their best defence. The lessons of the last world war show that those countries will win which have on the one hand the greatest freedom, and on the other

[1] Organization for European Economic Co-operation to administer Marshall Aid.

the greatest economic resources. One without the other is useless. These can only be secured for Europe by union. They will not be secured by the Brussels pact.

Furthermore, the conclusion of such a pact is apt to lull people into a false sense of security and to make them think that they have achieved something, whereas in fact they have achieved nothing. Was the Locarno Pact of any defensive or other value to Europe? If not, why do we expect anything from the Brussels Pact? The Locarno Pact neither prevented war, nor did anything to improve the resources of European States, and the Brussels Pact will share exactly the same fate. It does not deal with the fundamental problem of European development, which is the creation of a sovereign political organization on democratic lines, able to deal with the problems of Europe as a whole.

The O.E.E.C. is another example, but in many ways a more practical one. This body has been created under an agreement between the receiving countries for the purpose of administering Marshall aid. But every day reports are coming which indicate that the Council is inadequate for its task. Only recently delegates on the Council complained that some demands made were straining the co-operation between the States of Europe too severely. This is the essence of the whole problem. Any approach by function can mean co-operation and nothing else. It must rest always on the unanimous decisions of the representatives of governments. It can never have power because it has not got authority.

The O.E.E.C. will not bring about the integration of the economics of Europe. The lifetime of the Organization is limited to the operation of the Marshall Plan. But the Organization cannot bring about the integration of important movements of working populations, real planning of industry and agriculture, consolidated programmes of national investment, or effective common development of new sources of food and raw material supplies, nor will it bring about a pooling of the one commodity in shortest supply of all, American dollars. For the governments who are members of the Organization do not wish to take these measures. They are not yet prepared for the material sacrifices involved. But until they are, nothing that is really necessary will be done. An organization of this kind would only have the requisite power if it were the properly constituted executive of a Federal Government of the countries of Western Europe.

It is said that the Benelux customs union is a step in the right direction. But what is wanted is not a customs union but a free trading area, and a customs union does not secure a free trading area. It does not create one Finance Minister for all the territory of the three countries with power to determine the customs duties for the whole area. Nor does it bring to an end barriers at the

frontiers, import licences and other hindrances to trade. To do this would mean each State giving up its power over customs to a new authority. This is the difference in the approach. Moreover, customs duties are only a reflection of the policy of governments. To remove customs barriers and import restrictions you would have to settle the inter-State indebtedness of the different countries of Europe. This means a common currency, which can only come about after a political union of some kind. It must be fully realized that no solution to the economic problems of the different states of Europe will be arrived at except in a political framework. You cannot get the benefits of a customs union between a free trade country like Holland and a protectionist country like Belgium unless the two are willing to give up their power to collect customs to a new political authority. The power to levy customs is directly linked with industrial policy and financial policy. If you desire one customs policy for three countries, one authority is required to make decisions for all, which can deal both with their taxation and their general industrial policy. Recently when the Foreign Ministers went to the Hague for their meeting under the Brussels Agreement, an American newspaper described how on the 'Etoile du Nord', the international luxury express which makes a daily Paris-Brussels-Amsterdam run, the delegates to the Western Union conference at the Hague had to show their passports, railroad tickets or cash sixteen times to sixteen different officials in the three countries. At a Dutch border town the train was held up for an hour while inspectors made sure the passengers had not bought too many U.S. cigarettes during the 20-minute stop at Brussels. In France, the delegates could lunch on the train and pay in French francs. In Belgium a little later they could eat the same lunch, but the Belgian rate of exchange made the meal cost three times as much. If a delegate had a cup of coffee while the train was in France, he got one lump of sugar. In Belgium he could have two lumps. In the Netherlands he got as much sugar as he liked—not because the Dutch have more sugar, but because they have a different tourist policy. No doubt the conference had weightier matters than lumps of sugar to discuss, but the sugar symbolized how little progress towards real unity the five Benelux nations have made since signing the Brussels Pact last March. In four months Western Union has gone a little way towards military integration, but hardly a step toward economic or political unity. Nor will it move an inch until a transfer of sovereignty to a new Union has taken place.

*Socialists and European Union*

"Whatever general reasons there may be for preferring international to national action", writes an important Socialist, "there

are no *a priori* grounds for desiring any European union irrespective of its character. After all, Hitler came nearer to integrating the economies of Europe in his New Order than democratic governments can hope to go in a similar space of time". We have to face this issue of the character of the federation.

In the first place, the constitution of the federation should not be an obstruction to socialism, but should facilitate its realization, if and when the people desire. Obviously any federation must have adequate powers to give effect to the wishes of the people, whatever they may eventually prove to be. This is important, because many Conservatives have argued in the past for a federation in whose limited powers they see their best defence against socialism. Australia presents the best example of what is feared might happen. The constitution was drawn up at a time when modern social ideas and developments were almost unknown, so that the Federal Parliament in Australia has no power directly to deal with many present-day social questions. There is no present limit to the powers of the parliaments of the states of Europe. Are we to surrender those powers to a federal parliament which, because of the limitations imposed, will make it impossible to have socialism either in Great Britain or in Europe? In other words, is the support of the federal movement by the Conservative forces of Europe merely a method of putting obstacles in the way of nationalization or the common ownership of many of the resources of the State?

The second objection of the Socialists to the movement for federation is a fear of a continuation of Colonial imperialism. The Socialist argues that any federation of western Europe, which would naturally bring in the whole of their overseas territories, numbering some 150 millions of people, should be on the basis of racial equality, political liberty and the fullest economic co-operation.

Thirdly there is the question of eastern and western Europe. The argument here is that the door should be left open not only for the eastern European countries to come into the Federation, but for the peoples of eastern Europe to be able to enter into trade treaties with the West. This was made quite clear in the discussions which have recently taken place, and the Hague resolutions provide specifically for the federation or union of the whole of Europe in the hope of getting rid of the division between East and West.

In the fourth place, there is the whole problem of the relationship of Europe to the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. The Socialists argue that the defence policy of the European federation must be based upon the principle that the Federation should be independent and free from all political and military entanglements with either the U.S.S.R. or the U.S.A. In any possible future conflict the Federation of Europe must not be used by capitalist America as a bridgehead for an attack on communist Russia. That is the issue in

its crudest form. My own view is expressed in the resolutions of the Hague Conference, which provide that any union or federation of Europe should be designed to protect the security of its constituent peoples, should be free from outside control, and should not be directed against any other nation. If Europe is united and has a Foreign Minister and a Defence Minister, if it can plan and develop its industrial production, it will become a power as strong as either the U.S.A. or the U.S.S.R. There is much greater security for the world with Russia, Europe and the U.S.A. as three great world powers, each equally strong, than there is in a situation where Russia and America are first-class powers, ideologically in conflict, with Europe divided into twenty-five nations of different political ideologies, varying in economic strength.

Fifthly, the final Socialist objection relates to the powers of the Federation, to which reference has already been made, arguing that the social and economic policies of the Federation must be based upon the realization that no trading area large enough to enable the constituent States to achieve economic recovery, stability and independence is possible except on the basis of collective economic planning. Many non-socialists accept that view. Planning does not divide the parties of Europe today. But the Socialist then goes on to contend that public ownership and control of all industries and social and economic welfare is necessary. Others put it in a somewhat different way. One writer, for example, says that we should carefully "note the form which the demand for a federation of Western Europe takes when it is put by non-socialists. The typical suggestion is for a central federation authority responsible for foreign policy and defence, but whose economic powers, if they exist at all, are so limited as to make it quite impossible for socialism to be introduced on the supranational scale. We must insist therefore that the central authority of the Western Union has sufficient powers in the economic field to make socialist planning possible". Others argue that there must be a minimum acceptance of public ownership of the key sources of economic power, including coal, steel, transport and the financial system.

These objections can be clarified in discussion. In most countries coal, currency and transport are under public control. It therefore would not be difficult to get agreement here. The real issue is whether we accept the need for a European Parliament and Government. If we say yes to that, we can say yes on terms, namely, that the powers of the Parliament are adequate to give effect to the wishes of the people of the Federation and that they are not limited in such a way as to act as a buffer against social change.

I do not think that when faced with the real issue Socialists will insist that the federation must be based on public ownership and that it must be a socialist U.S.E. After all, none of the democracies

of Western Europe is based on public ownership yet. Democracy is *purely* a piece of machinery.

*Obstacles to European Union*

There are, of course, many obstacles in the way of European union. Statesmen and people think in terms of their own countries and refuse to face the changes that have taken place. Fifty years ago, four of the States of Europe, Italy, Germany, France and Britain were great powers; today not one of them is a great power. Their place has been taken by the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. There is, too, the general distrust by each State of the nationalism of the other States. Ignorance, particularly ignorance of the conditions which operate in the other States of Europe, the nature of their politics, the composition of their governments, plays its part in the mental obstacles to federation.

But another group of objections comes from the practical people, who think that European federation is Utopian; that Europe is not ripe for union; that for a successful union there must be a group of communities united by blood or creed or language or political tradition, none of which, they argue, is to be found in Europe. Then there are the economic obstacles. It is said that the standards of living of the different countries of Europe vary so greatly that it is impossible to unite them, and finally that any union of Europe would be dominated by Germany or by Britain. It is true also that every country has its own particular axe to grind, its own particular obstacle to raise: Great Britain and her Dominions, Sweden and her neutrality, Italy and her colonies. Even Iceland, having just secured her independence, gives that as a reason for not coming into a federation.

But when we look at present-day Europe, these arguments carry little weight, and the obstacles are not really so formidable. In what way are the German-speaking Catholics in Lucerne "united in blood or creed or language" with the French-speaking Protestants of Geneva? Certainly no more than the French of Lyons with the Germans of Munich. There is no more difference in "blood, creed or language" between the French in France and the Germans in Germany than the French-speaking Swiss and the German-speaking Swiss. Why then do these people, equally similar or equally different in blood, creed and language, living in France and Germany, wage war periodically, and yet live in peace side by side in Switzerland? For the simple reason that in Switzerland they are united by a common legal order under a federal government, whereas in France and Germany they are separated by independent sovereignties. Before the federal constitution became effective, the Swiss cantons also waged wars as other sovereign power units do.

The essence of the position is that the people who argue about

the need for a group of communities united by blood, creed, language and political tradition do not understand the nature of a federal system of government. The purpose of federation is to bring together people of diverse types in such a way that they can keep their diversity in matters which are not common to all the peoples, and give it up in matters which are. It is absurd to say that federalism is only possible among people who think alike, speak the same language, go to the same church and love one another all the time. We shall never have paradise on earth, and government exists for the purpose of making the best out of the conditions in which people live. Federation is purely a piece of political machinery. It is not an exclusive club for like-minded people. It is a bit of machinery which permits people speaking different languages, going to different churches, believing in different social and economic concepts, to continue to mistrust one another, dislike one another, hate one another, and even fight one another, but by legal methods, without shooting and without war. There is no federation today in which there are not conflicts of all kinds going on all the time. In Australia there are conflicts between the industrialists of the east and the agriculturists of the west. In the United States and in Canada the battle still goes on between the State governments and the Federal authority. The creation of a Federation of Europe would do nothing more than provide a skeleton piece of machinery, which succeeding generations could use for good or ill for the development of Europe as a whole; a piece of machinery by which people can go on fighting their political and economic battles without war.

It is this conception which the practical critics of European union overlook. They seem to think that European federation is going to solve the conflicts between men and groups of men. On the contrary, a European federation merely provides the framework—a parliament of Europe—in which the innumerable and inevitable conflicts can be resolved by discussion without recourse to war; and further, a European federation, by uniting a whole lot of diverse economies and peoples, can provide a framework for the development of the largest industrial and economic area that the world has ever seen.

It is of course at this stage that the Utopian hurdle is created. It is said that federation is an ultimate aim and a far-off ideal, something that we can look forward to, but that, at present, all we can hope for is co-operation between the European states, a miniature league, a Brussels pact, a treaty creating machinery for co-operation, such as was recently entered into in Paris. It is difficult to attach much weight to this argument. We had a confederation in the form of the League of Nations after 1919, but war broke out in 1939. If paper and ink and treaties could have brought

about European unity, then we had quantities of them between the wars, with the Locarno Pact, the Kellogg Pact, and the other treaties of that kind, but the fact must be realized, that it was the practical people in 1919 and from 1919-1939 who completely let the world down. The fault of the peace settlement of 1919 was not that its negotiators were moved by ideals too exalted for practical politics. The faults arose because the negotiators were practical politicians. They were thinking in terms of sovereign States. They were not moved by ideals but by ideas and terms quite archaic in the 20th century. All practical considerations now point to a union as the only way to stimulate inter-state trade in Europe, as the only way to stimulate agricultural and industrial production in Europe, and as the only way to make Europe independent of American aid.

When we come to the practical argument that federations must rest on a common political tradition, this does in fact apply to Europe. Professor Tawney has pointed out that Europe has a cultural unity with a political diversity not to be found in Russia, China or North America, and he writes that nature has made it difficult for parts of Europe to live in peace but it has also made it difficult for them to live in isolation. For it remains true today as it was true 150 years ago when Hamilton wrote, that "to look for a continuation of harmony between a number of independent, unconnected sovereignties in the same neighbourhood, would be to disregard the uniform course of human events, and to set at defiance the accumulated experience of ages".

Whatever the practical obstacles to European Union in 1948, they existed in the same way against American Union in 1787; and with all the difficulties that may arise, with all the faults that any system of federation which we create may have, the fact still remains that if we apply the principles of federalism to Europe, we can create a community more powerful, more prosperous, more intelligent and more free than the world has as yet known.

*Where Do We Go From Here?*

In a letter sent to a friend in Paris on the 22nd October, 1787, Benjamin Franklin wrote as follows:

> I send you enclos'd the propos'd new Federal Constitution for these States. I was engag'd 4 months of the last summer in the Convention that for'd it. It is now sent by Congress to the several States for their Confirmation. If it succeeds, I do not see why you might not in Europe carry the project of good Henry 4th into Execution, by forming a Federal Union and One Grand Republic of all its different States and Kingdoms, by means of a like Convention, for we had many interests to reconcile.

That was over 150 years ago: the project of good Henry the

Fourth is still unexecuted; a federal union remains a concept of the future: and the One Grand Republic has yet to be created. Since he wrote, Europe has faced the Napoleonic Wars, the Revolutions of 1830, 1848 and 1918, the unification of Italy and Germany, the rise of nationality, nationalism and the spread of democracy. All of which have led, not to a Grand Republic, but to the thirty years' world war of 1914-1945. With that background where do we go from here? Are we to contemplate a Europe divided into Catholics who look to Rome, Communists who look to Moscow, Capitalists who look to Washington, and Socialists who look to London, and that these four movements, like the four capitals, will never come together?

The year 1948 has seen enormous progress in the idea of European Union. At the Hague Conference in May, European opinion approved the idea in general terms, but the decisions unanimously arrived at were very important: it was recognized that existing international instruments were inadequate for European peace and economic development; it was recognized that the states of Europe had to give up some of their sovereign powers to a new European authority; it was recognized that Germany was an integral part of Europe, and it was agreed that as a matter of urgency a European Assembly should be called for the purpose of going into the whole question of a European union. In August the French Government took the momentous step of urging upon the five Brussels Powers (the Benelux countries and Britain) that a European Assembly should be convened, and that the five Brussels Powers should meet for preparatory conference to work out the agenda and procedure and to issue invitations to the seventeen States of western Europe who were co-operating together for the European Recovery Programme.

Finally at Interlaken in September a plan for action was prepared and overwhelmingly adopted by two hundred members of parliament from thirty European states. The Interlaken plan widens the French proposals and asks specifically for an Assembly of the seventeen countries co-operating in the European economic recovery programme. It issued an appeal to the seventeen governments asking them to take steps to convene a European Assembly before March 1949. It set out the agenda for the Assembly, the way in which it should be convened, and in a resolution attached to the appeal it defined the basic principals of the Constitution of a European Federation in ten points. In general terms it laid down the composition of a European Parliament, its powers, the nature of the executive and of the judiciary. It then went on to define the rights of States in a European federation, to indicate the financial powers of the Federation, and it suggested the way in which the Federation should deal with overseas territories and the alteration

of its own constitution. It reduced to practical terms the essential questions which any Assembly would have to consider, and it gave in its draft principles the basis, not only for the discussion before the Assembly takes place, but for consideration by the Assembly itself.

In journeying from the Hague to Interlaken, we have moved from the general to the particular. The definition of union is a condition precedent to an understanding of the whole problem. At Interlaken the term was defined: it means a federation, the United States of Europe, it means a European Cabinet responsible to Parliament like the Cabinets of the European states, it means that we have a European Prime Minister, a Finance Minister, a Minister for Customs, a Minister for Defence, a Minister for Transport, a Minister for Agriculture and all the other portfolios that are associated with Cabinet Government and a democratic system. And the Federal Parliament will have powers to give to Europe a common currency, common Customs, common defence, and plan the economic resources of the great continent.

The next step is with governments. The Brussels powers will shortly be meeting; they will have before them the demand of the French Government for an Assembly and the Interlaken plan. In effect they must consider whether or not to call a European Assembly, and the Interlaken plan gives them all the material they need. The first year's programme for American Aid has now been agreed and the O.E.E.C. has set up a number of Committees to study the economic problems of Europe. A European Assembly convened now could only do good; for it would provide a platform for representative Europeans to state clearly their conception of what European Union means. This is the next step.

In 1787 a few unrepresentative Americans met at Annapolis to discuss the condition of their country. They sent an appeal to the States to call a Convention to draft a new Federal constitution. This appeal led to the Convention at Philadelphia and so to the Constitution of the United States of America. If the Brussels Powers respond in the same way to the Interlaken appeal, an Assembly can be held of representatives from the European States out of which there could arise the United States of Europe to lead the peoples out of their present disunity and poverty into a strength and prosperity similar to that which they see in the New World across the seas.

# CORRESPONDENCE

*To the Editor, "Congregational Quarterly"*

DEAR SIR,

Will you allow me to comment on the article of my friend Dr. Davies on "Chosen People: The Approach to Antisemitism"? Our real difference is shown by his final sentence: "It is well to recognize that the ultimate source of Antisemitism has been a misunderstanding on the part of both Jew and Gentile of the essential meaning of *chosenness*, and that sociological and political factors, however relevant for its understanding, are secondary". In the Christian belief that men are called of God 'sociological and political factors' do not enter at all. But the essential difference between Christianity and Judaism is not that in one individuals are 'chosen' in a different way from the other, but that in Judaism the emphasis is on the people, not the individual. The emphasis should not be '*chosen* people', but 'chosen *people*', and if a people, a community, is to be chosen, then 'sociological and political factors' are central, since without them a community cannot exist.

We have therefore to decide whether God is uninterested in our life in community, or regards the whole of it as secondary, or whether modern sociologists and psychologists are right in believing that man cannot be considered whole apart from his membership of a community. If that is so, the ordering of sociological and political factors is as important in the designs of God for this world as are the human personalities of which the community is composed. It is on that supposition that it is natural to see, as Dr. Davies rightly says that I see, the revelations of God to men at Sinai and at Calvary as two permanent and equally important facts in the unfolding of the divine design.

It seems to me that the history of the Christian Church supports this view. For it is impossible to show that the Christian tradition has ever exhibited the same certainty and creativity in the field of communal activity that it has undoubtedly manifested in the lives of individuals. Today, confronted by the danger of atomic war and the moral breakdown of society, we are shamed by the fact that the Church has nothing clear to say, and no clear leadership to give; and we have to face the additional shame that it has been within the society called Christendom that the danger has arisen and the breakdown has occurred, because in the past also neither counsel nor leadership was given corporately by the Churches.

It is these two facts, the belief that God is as concerned with society as with the individuals in it, and that the historic evidence shows that the power which flows from Calvary has not guided men to build societies acceptable to God, which, together with a study of the comparable period in the history of the Jewish community, make me believe that it is from Sinai that there still flows the divine revelation of how God wills that men shall live in society.

Yours faithfully,

JAMES PARKES.

# BOOKS OF THE QUARTER

*(The place of publication is London unless stated otherwise)*

**Religion and Culture.** The Gifford Lectures delivered in Edinburgh, 1947. By CHRISTOPHER DAWSON. Sheed & Ward. 10s. 6d.

**Christianity and Civilisation.** The Gifford Lectures delivered in St. Andrews, 1947. By EMIL BRUNNER. Nisbet. 10s.

**The Apocalypse of History.** By E. LAMPERT. Faber. 18s.

**The Christian Understanding of History.** By E. C. RUST. Lutterworth Press. 17s. 6d.

**The Crisis in Human Affairs.** By J. G. BENNETT. Hodder & Stoughton. 8s. 6d.

**Recovery of Man.** By F. R. BARRY. Nisbet. 8s. 6d.

In one way or another, each of these six books is concerned with history and what goes on in it; and in particular with what is going on now. They form an interesting and instructive collection, which we can review in three contrasting pairs.

The first contrast is between two Gifford Lecturers in natural theology—the Roman Catholic Christopher Dawson and the Reformed theologian Emil Brunner. Mr. Dawson brings to his treatment of Religion and Culture a mature knowledge of Comparative Religion, and his book is a distinct accession to the literature of that subject. Different cultures have different and characteristic (but not exclusive) sources of religious knowledge. Thus prophecy, the organ of divine inspiration, is typical of Islam; priesthood, the organ of divine knowledge, which attends to ritual and sacrifice and provides a professional religiously learned class, is characteristic of Indian culture; while kingship, the organ of divine power, finds classical expression in Egypt. Mr. Dawson traces the growth of sacred science, of law, and of the way of perfection as three ways in which religion has deeply affected culture. In a last chapter on religion and cultural change, we have some interesting (and justifying) analyses of the cultural effects of various forms of nonconformity; but the main conclusion is that religion is a unifying force in times of synthesis (as in Europe during the middle ages) and a revolutionary force in times of cultural disintegration (as at the Reformation). These forces co-exist in most cultures as two opposing forces. Religion, Mr. Dawson holds, must neither become too involved in any cultural synthesis, or it will lose its transcendental character; nor become too detached from the prevalent culture, or it will lead to its secularization. "The recovery of moral control and the return to spiritual order have now become the indispensable conditions of human survival". This requires neither a new religion nor a new culture, but a restoration of the vital relation between them.

This is a learned and suggestive book, but is unduly scrupulous in conforming to the terms of the Gifford bequest in its exclusion of the discussion of 'revealed' religion. There are some tantalizingly illuminating parallels to the Bible and Christian cultural traditions; but the phenomenon of prophecy, *e.g.*, is discussed without examination of Hebrew prophecy, and while Mr. Dawson finds some remarkable parallels in Islam, they are no substitute for the Bible. Surely Hebrew prophecy can be discussed as a phenomenon of history and therefore as comparable with similar occurrences. Another reflection concerns the term 'natural theology', which in its modern distorted form has been a frustration to Mr. Dawson, as to others. Originally it was used to distinguish a scientific or philosophical study of theology

from that knowledge of the gods which consisted in the telling of (mostly immoral) stories about them. In this, the proper, sense (see Book X of Plato's *Laws*) Christian theology is truly a 'natural' theology, since it explicates certain events occurring in history. This is a good book; but, to use Mr. Dawson's own classification, it belongs to the 'priestly', not the prophetic or kingly class.

Professor Brunner takes a very different view of his responsibilities under the will of Lord Gifford. He would be the last to deny that Christianity was a 'revealed' religion, but, as I imagine, he does not think of its relationship to civilization as a problem of revealed theology. The book starts from the stark fact that Christian civilization is in danger, and consists of a rich and masterly examination of the chief problems of a metaphysical or philosophical kind in which Christian faith can be held to have a decisive contribution to make: the problems of being, truth, time, meaning, man, humanity, justice, freedom and, finally, creativity. Brunner brings much learning to his task, and one of the great pleasures of reading his book is to marvel at his erudition and the intriguing and suggestive perspectives it enables him to draw. It is impossible to sketch an outline of the work here, but its main concern is to bring the contribution of biblical religion to the problem confronting our civilization, and to test it thereby. A typical analysis can be found in his discussion of freedom. At the beginning of the modern period a battle had to be undertaken against a false, freedom-destroying authority in the erection and maintenance of which the Church itself was implicated. The fight had three phases. First, an idealist liberalism still clung to the recognition of a transcendent ground of human dignity. Second, the transcendental element, the divine moral law, disappears, and utility and expediency replace it. Third, a reaction against the consequent anarchy takes place, and a new authority of power is established. Similar movements have made one element after another 'independent' of the once widely recognized, transcendent ground of culture.

All this is excellently done, and the questions we want to ask are no more than a tribute to the stimulating qualities of the book. Could not the contribution of biblical religion have been stated more explicitly—and more truly!—if there had been some attempt to set out from biblical expositions at various points? The Bible has its own terminology to describe time—*kairos*, fulfilment, *chronos*, *aeon*. It speaks of a freedom wherewith Christ has set us free: would not the whole argument have gained in richness had these and similar contributions been considered? And lastly, I want to comment again on the difficulty I have with Brunner's treatment of the subject-object relation in knowledge. It seems to me that in the main it is *not* meant by that distinction to say that the subject in any sense 'possesses' its object: that would only be true in a theory that reduced relations to qualities and objects of knowledge, therefore, to parts or possessions of the mind. Surely the terms are formal and functional only. It is not that God is an object of my knowledge that is significant, but that the object of my knowledge is God, that He has entered into this relationship with me and thereby transfigured it. But my last word must be one of very high appreciation of a fascinating and discerning study.

The next contrast is between the Russian Orthodox layman, Dr. Lampert, and the Baptist minister and tutor, Mr. Rust. Dr. Lampert writes about the Apocalypse of History, by which he means that we can live at any moment either superficially or 'deeply'. If the latter, we may trace any situation to its limits, to its 'crisis', and that is to understand it in its ultimate significance, or eschatologically. This is by far the most difficult book of the six, but by far, I think, the most rewarding. Dr. Lampert brings an adequate philosophical apparatus to his discussion of time, and makes a real effort to deal

with the biblical, especially the New Testament, usages. He fails, I think, to do these full justice, for what the New Testament has to say about time as *kairos* is not just to teach us the lesson of 'timeliness', but to witness to us of the one great *kairos* in which God has acted decisively and finally in His Son. There is one passage I have read again and again without really understanding it. I mention it because it purports to say why the Orthodox Church takes the line it does about social change. I hope that Dr. Lampert will write again, and will make this important point clear.

The whole of this book is worth reading and pondering. On all its great subjects—time, the End, Man, Destiny, Freedom, Iniquity, Providence, Christ, the Kingdom—it has much that is profound and always something formative to say. Dr. Lampert must continue to write for us: he is an excellent mediator of Eastern or Russian thought to us, and not only ecclesiastical, but political—for there is a very able exposition of Marx's humanism which corrects a lot of current misconception. But welcome as this contribution is, I find its distinctive ideas so far unacceptable, and even unadaptable. I cannot believe that the deification of man is a biblical notion; and though I think I know what he means, I cannot assent to Dr. Lampert's argument that man shares in his own creation. Finally, it is difficult to gather just what, in the end, the Apocalypse of History is. We 'prepare' the coming of the Kingdom from within time by 'self-transcendence', and the end that comes from without "cannot but be destruction". But that does not fit his own reference to the end that comes as "a *consummation* of the whole process" (p. 54). But if anyone wants a book which will really demand a facing of the issues and a thinking through to the end, this is it.

Mr. Rust sets out to write on *The Christian Understanding of History*, and by that, as he tells us, he has world-history in mind. But I am not sure that a secular historian would really learn from this book what he might think he ought to be able to learn—what theological interpretation, if any, Mr. Rust puts upon secular history. It may be unfair to ask this of him, for his gifts and endowments are obviously much richer in the biblical than in this particular philosophical one; but I cannot help thinking that the secular historian will be rightly disappointed, though he will read a very good account of what Christian theologians have learnt about salvation-history from their reading of the Bible. And that is no small achievement on Mr. Rust's part.

The work is divided into three: Basic Principles; The Course of Salvation History and its Eschatological Framework; Salvation History and World History. In many ways Part II is the best of the book, though it does not 'tie up' quite successfully with the rest. My basic difficulty, however, is to try to establish what Mr. Rust means by history. At times it seems that he wants to say that God acts in history and that such action gives meaning to history and indeed makes it such. But elsewhere he speaks of the possibility of judging even divine actions 'on the historical level'. Or again, at one point time is 'disintegrated eternity', and at another the actual succession of history should belong to ultimate reality and be real to God. With Dr. Lampert Mr. Rust holds that eternity is not only 'above' time, but also at its end—as consummation. He adds that the supra-historical consummation transfigures all history so that secular history becomes part of salvation-history. But how? And how can I discern that, if at all, *now*? Mr. Rust is perhaps too much of a religious devotee for his task. When he speaks of the epochs of history he centres them in Augustine, Francis, Luther, Calvin, Wesley, Carey—an interesting list; but what about Charlemagne, Frederick the Great, Peter the Great, Napoleon, Victoria, Wilhelm II, Hitler? Have these no significance because they are not connected with the Kingdom? Or is there not rather a dialectic of history, in which God can speak to man through pagans and tyrants, as the Old Testament prophets would testify?

Mr. Rust has set out with clarity a good deal of material, and we can but be grateful to him for that: but he has not brought a constructive synthesis yet, though his book suggests that one can and will come.

The last contrast is between the scientific humanist, J. G. Bennett, and the Christian humanist, the Bishop of Southwell, better known as F. R. Barry. With much of what Mr. Bennett tries to do we can have nothing but sympathy. He sees the tremendous danger of what he calls this 'megalanthropic epoch', in which man has asserted his importance and powers in absurd exaggeration, the view that man matters to God being its highest conceivable form. What Calvin would have replied to that can be left to the imagination. Mr. Bennett proceeds to prick the swollen bubbles of our human pride. We have no 'self' in us, but only a number of selves, all striving for mastery. We have no power of choice, but spend most of our life 'asleep'. We have no power to achieve what we want to do. If all this be true, it is high time we became aware of it and indeed with much of the 'debunking' of the 'megalanthropic age' Christians will have considerable sympathy.

But while this megalanthropic epoch is ending as it must, a new one is being born. Mr. Bennett introduces us to two ways of setting matters right, the psycho-static and the psycho-kinetic. The former holds that man's nature is unchangeable, and that the betterment of our age must come by environmental change; the latter holds that man's nature can be changed (as did St. Paul!). But how? Answer: by taking eternity seriously, although the eternity expounded is of a new kind. It is really stored up energy—the pendulum momentarily at rest at the top of its swing is one example, or a rock poised on another, immovable until its support goes. Eternity is the potential aspect of energy and is thus the invisible element in all reality, as discharge of energy is the visible. Next, human nature is analyzed into body, soul, 'personality', and essence; where essence is our 'pure potentiality' and 'personality' the sum total of all our habits, attitudes, motives, *etc.* We can thus see that man has a potentiality for self-creation, if he takes 'eternity' seriously. This seems to me to end in a worse megalanthropism than before, where man is not only of importance to his Creator, but becomes his own creator. And how can any new analysis demonstrate a personality in view of the devastating assertion earlier, that we are really a multiplicity of selves? Mr. Bennett will have to think again, and it is to be hoped, when he does, that he will try to understand more of the Christian doctrine of man which other writers under review ably discuss.

Dr. Barry's book was written in draft as a contribution to the deliberations of the bishops of the Anglican Communion at Lambeth this year. It constitutes a powerful plea for a Christian humanism and begins with the assertion that the Gospel rehabilitated man in the ancient world, setting his life in the grand dimensions of God's purpose disclosed in Jesus Christ. Admittedly humanism since the Renaissance has become increasingly separated from its religious roots, but that does not spell its essential falsity. There is need, in any event, for a return to reason in this age, as well as a need for poetry and imagination. Christians and Humanists need one another. In the discussion of God and man, Dr. Barry insists that man, being made in God's image, is fundamentally good. This is not further specified, but the following discussion leaves one feeling that there is no room for a profound conception of sin, and therefore an inadequate basis for a gospel of deliverance from or a forgiveness of it. Certainly the fact of man's fall cannot *itself* be the *pledge* of his restoration (p. 60). In the chapter on the Primacy of the Personal we are led to see the connection between the affirmation of a personal, living God, and the emphasis on the importance of personal relations in human life. But by far the best chapter in an always lively book is the last, on "The

Redemption of History". Here Dr. Barry really takes hold of the tragic note of Christianity, and will not let any optimism or sentiment weaken his analysis of our modern tragedy in the light of the Cross. The Resurrection is the assurance of the entrance of the powers of the age to come into this our world, where, if we are faithful, we may be given to share the inheritance of the saints in light. To spread such a faith is among the Christian's most effective contributions to the Recovery of Man.

This book is rich, but it is also weak. Its weakness lies in its being, in Mr. Dawson's phrase, a 'priestly' product. It is a plea that we should get our knowledge right and so be free to spread the truth. But the real and desperate need is to get our souls right: they, not our minds, are desperately sick, and sin is their incurable disease. But while we should have welcomed a fuller insight into this evangelical centre of the faith, we are none the less grateful for a book which will bring central Christian insights before many Christians who are humanists and (we hope) humanists who are yet Christians.

JOHN MARSH.

**How Came Our Faith: A Study of the Religion of Israel and its Significance for the Modern World.** By W. A. L. ELMSLIE. Cambridge University Press. 21s.

Though Dr. Elmslie defends his title, it is a dubious one, since (without the sub-title) it suggests the sphere of Church History rather than of the Old Testament. This said, the work deserves high praise for its purpose of presenting the development of religion in Israel as of the utmost importance for understanding Christianity, and as relevant for our own times.

The book is in three main parts. First, we have "The Old Testament To-day". This sets the stage, so to speak, with a careful sketch of "Modern Study of the Old Testament" and an appreciation of its value as literature as well as because it is Scripture. In the second part, "The Religion of the Hebrews" in general is presented. "The God of the Hebrews" is contrasted with "The Gods of Canaan". Dr. Elmslie believes that Yah "was not a proper name but an ejaculation associated with the cult of the moon, and that before the time of Moses the Aramæan ancestors of the Hebrews were moon-worshippers". The influence of the desert on Hebrew religion is emphasized, and we are shown how "Naïve trust in the God of the desert mountain developed eventually into worship of Jehovah as the *national* God of the two Hebrew kingdoms". "Both intellectually and morally the end thereof was Death". So we reach the climax, in "The Faith of the Prophets", as a part of Hebrew religion "not congruous with the ordinary Hebrew ideas of Jehovah, but antagonistic to it, and unique in religious history". The greater Prophets are considered in turn, under the headings God with us, Conscience and Reason, Mercy, Love, The Eternal in the Temporal, God and the Individual, and God and the Nations; and the conclusion is reached that "their Visions did not yield a hotchpotch of conflicting ideas, but convictions which cohere as a profound ethical Monotheism. Taken in relation to Jesus Christ, the essential aspects of the beliefs constitute the *only* religious interpretation of Existence of which modern thought must take account".

"What was wrong with the Canaanites religiously was that they had a squint . . . ": in his style, by captions for sections such as " 'A Depression from Iceland' (the Infallible Bible)", by his use of the form Jehovah, Dr. Elmslie has gone a long way to meet the general reader whom he hopes to interest, and some of these things may offend the more fastidious. At all events, it is true that he has written not just another decorous textbook, but

a work in which faith and scholarship are finely fused in a genuinely missionary purpose; and, whether or not that purpose is achieved, many a minister will be grateful for this book. GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

**The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah.** By C. R. NORTH. Oxford University Press. 15s.

In recent years study of the Servant Songs in this country has shied away in the main from any sort of Messianic interpretation because of its apparent artificiality. The application of details from *Isaiah* 53 to the passion of Jesus may at times be illuminating, but to imagine that the Song contains a preview of the life and death of Jesus is to miss the essence of Old Testament prophecy. But this desire to avoid literalism has led often to a pseudo-historical interpretation—whether in terms of a particular individual, Jeremiah, Josiah, Jehoiachin, or who you please—or in terms of a community, Israel, the faithful remnant, the true Israel in the guise of a corporate personality.

Professor North leads us lucidly through all these, and points out their value and their inadequacy, and finally leads up to a new Messianic approach to the Songs which neither falls into literalism nor ignores the reality of the historical circumstances out of which the Songs arose.

His conclusion is that the "Servant is a soteriological rather than a political Messianic figure". "The Prophet . . . saw Reality in a few brief but vivid flashes" and Jesus was able to present the way of the Cross convincingly in the terms of the Servant Songs. The fact that there is no known intermediate stage between the Songs and Jesus suggests that in his deepest moments the prophet did grasp something of the true nature and purpose of God, and that that vision was fulfilled in Jesus.

There is an enormous wealth of material in this book, and it provides an excellent guide to the literature of the subject. It also offers a positive and helpful approach to the whole question of the relation between Old Testament prophecy and the life and work of Jesus. Professor North has done a real service to scholarship; at the same time his book will give a sound basis for anyone who is concerned to preach the Old Testament realistically.

PETER R. ACKROYD.

**The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism.** By W. F. FLEMINGTON. S.P.C.K. 10s. 6d.

This book appears at a time when there is considerable discussion of baptism because of the unworthy and inadequate views about it which are all too common. It will therefore receive a ready welcome, and it can be said at once that it is a thorough piece of work distinguished by exact scholarship and cogent argument..

In the first part Mr. Flemington discusses Jewish washings and proselyte baptism and the baptism of John as the antecedents of Christian baptism. He clearly brings out the significance of John's baptism as an adaptation and extension of proselyte baptism, whose implicit demand for repentance and moral cleansing is now made explicit in the ethical and eschatological nature of the new rite.

In the second part a review of the New Testament evidence about Christian baptism in *Acts*, the Pauline and Johannine writings, and elsewhere, leads to the conclusion that from the earliest period baptism was the recognized mode of admission into the Church. As such it also, as well as the Eucharist, "proclaimed the Lord's death", for Paul's frequent linking of Christ's death and resurrection with baptism merely underlines the already existing attitude to the rite. Baptism is a symbolic representation of

the *kerygma*, and is the expression of response by the believer to its message of salvation. Frequently, too, there are involved the gift of the Spirit, and sonship.

The writer passes in the third part to a full and interesting consideration of the authority behind Christian baptism. It was not merely that the early Church took over the rite from John: it did so on the authority of Jesus Himself. Mr. Flemington believes it probable that Jesus delivered some injunction to baptize to His disciples, and that *Matthew* $28^{19}$, while not a dominical word, expresses the Church's belief or knowledge that He did. But much more stress is laid on Jesus' own baptism at the hands of John. Here is found the probable origin of the connection of the Spirit and of sonship with baptism in the early Church, while His reference to His death as a baptism (*Luke* $12^{50}$) produced the understanding of baptism as an effective symbol of death with Christ and resurrection with Him to a new life.

All this refers to the baptism of believers. What is the relation of infant baptism to the New Testament doctrine? Mr. Flemington devotes his last chapter to this, and he has much of value to say about the modification necessary in applying to infant baptism what the New Testament teaches concerning those who are baptized voluntarily and consciously in repentance and faith. Like his predecessor in this field, H. G. Marsh (*The Origin and Significance of the New Testament Baptism*, 1941), he believes that the practice of infant baptism already existed in New Testament times. For this there are both the evidence of the New Testament itself about the baptism of households (Lydia, the Philippian gaoler, Crispus, Stephanas), and inferences to be drawn from second century writers (Irenæus, Tertullian), to whom the custom was well known. Mr. Flemington closes his examination of this matter thus. "Infant baptism, so far from being less evangelical than believers' baptism, is in reality more so, because it even more unmistakably embodies the primary truth of the Christian gospel, namely, that the grace of God comes before everything else, and that man's only hope of salvation rests upon that Act of God in Jesus Christ, from which (as the chief writers of the New Testament so clearly and so unanimously demonstrate) this sacrament of the gospel draws all its meaning and efficacy". The infant's faith is supplied for him by that of the family and the Church in bringing him up "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord" until such time as he by his own faith lays hold on what was offered to him in baptism. There will be a large measure of agreement with the author's contention that in the revival of Church life a renewed emphasis on baptism as the beginning of the process which leads a young Christian to be received as a member is most needful.

A. J. B. Higgins.

**The Beginnings of Western Christendom.** By L. E. Elliott-Binns, D.D. Lutterworth Press. 25s.

This is a book which can be commended both to the specialist and to the general reader. Canon Elliott-Binns has ranged widely, and in this work he gives us the benefit of his mature judgment on many aspects of early Church History. His work is particularly valuable because of its balance and perspective, and it would be difficult to compress into 412 pages a better survey of the first three centuries of Western Christianity.

It would seem that Canon Elliott-Binns has accomplished more than he intended. He apparently wrote his book owing to his concern over some particular problems, such as the development of the papacy, and in order to make accessible material which he has gathered in special researches over the past quarter of a century. There is indeed much valuable material in

this book, especially from inscriptions and *graffiti*, which would not otherwise be readily available, and the references will put the keen student on many a useful and interesting trail.

The book is of even greater value, however, as a general survey of the early centuries of Church History in the West. It is not intended for beginners: "As the general outline of the story of the Beginnings of Western Christendom is readily available in textbooks on Early Church History, I have not related it in full detail, in order to give more space to what is less well known and less readily available" (p. 10). But as a supplement to the more usual type of Church History textbook, as a "refresher" for those whose detailed college studies are half-forgotten, or to give the "general view" so useful for those of wide interests, this book is invaluable. Canon Elliott-Binns expresses a great many opinions, but all are characterized by breadth of understanding and by keen insight, and he has every mark of the impartial historian.

The work is admirably arranged. The first part sketches the setting into which Christianity came, and the various factors receive due attention: political, economic and religious, Roman, Greek and Jewish. Then follow several chapters dealing with the expansion of the Church, treating the matter regionally. Within the limits of his space the section is excellently done. The author is ruthless in disposing of legend and exaggeration, but succeeds in leaving a clear picture of the probable courses of development. The third part deals with literature, dogma and creed, the ministry, worship and cognate matters.

We would specially commend the objectivity with which Canon Elliott-Binns deals with such difficult matters as the growth of the influence of Rome and of the papal authority. The evidence is scrupulously presented, and there is no sensing that any "case" is being presented. A similar impression is gained from his chapter on the ministry, so refreshing after the unedifying controversies of recent months.

Style and typography are good, and the book is pleasant to read. It is singularly free from misprints and other errors, and is well indexed. The student, the ordinary minister and the intelligent layman will all profit from this book.

AUBREY R. VINE.

**Isaac Watts: His Life and Works.** By ARTHUR PAUL DAVIS. Independent Press. 8s. 6d.

**Isaac Watts's A Guide to Prayer.** Abridged and Edited by HARRY ESCOTT, M.A. Epworth Press. 5s.

Our last number (p. 319) carried a short notice of Mr. Davis' study of Watts, and promised a fuller review. The book certainly demands this, for it is a remarkable piece of work. It is based on research into MSS. not only in libraries in England and America but in private collections such as those of Mr. Basil Cozens-Hardy and the Rev. Wilton Rix (a descendant of Watts' secretary). The facts are presented in a dry, impartial manner which admirably reflects Watts' own *via media* between "notions" and "rattle-brained enthusiasms". A striking character of the book, moreover, is the comprehensiveness with which the author portrays Watts as making his mark in one field after another, and proceeds to indicate the extent of his influence, posthumous as well as contemporary.

Great men are often big enough to count in spheres outside the one which they have mastered, and Watts, while pre-eminently a hymn-writer, was much more. In the field of children's literature, for instance, he "was not

really pioneering", yet his *Divine Songs* has been "the world's most popular children's classic". His catechetical works "have been published in languages ranging from Armenian to Zulu". More widely, "through his popularization of Locke, Watts helped to prepare the ground for modern education". From his *Logic*, in which he sought to simplify the language of logic, "literally hundreds of examples and definitions" were extracted by Johnson for his *Dictionary*.

In a most interesting chapter on Watts as poet, powerful evidence is provided for the conclusion that Watts is "a pre-romantic figure of some little significance". "Through Watts the melancholy, retirement, and graveyard themes of seventeenth-century poetry were transmitted to the Youngs, Blairs and Grays of the mid-eighteenth century". Mr. Davis recalls A. E. Housman's citation of a verse from Watts, and Housman's comment: "That simple verse, bad rhyme and all is poetry beyond Pope".

In another chapter, Watts' importance as a *source* of English hymnody is stated forcefully. Before him, hymn-singing "was generally frowned upon", and "in some cases churches were split and ministers ousted" over his hymns. But "Addison's hymns in the *Spectator* were probably inspired by Watts", and "if one were to make a graph of Watts's popularity, the line would rise steadily up to about 1865. Sixty thousand copies of *Psalms and Hymns* were sold that year". Matthew Arnold thought "When I survey" the best hymn in the English language.

When all is said, it is perhaps in Watts' *Guide to Prayer*, now neatly abridged by Mr. Escott, and in his corresponding *Exhortation to Ministers* on preaching, that the "leading Independent minister of London" is most nearly revealed. With his friend Philip Doddridge, the bicentenary of whose death will follow in three years' time, Watts carried forward the evangelical, experimental emphasis of Puritanism, and was the link between it and Methodism. In prayer, while we should prepare our thoughts beforehand, we should not confine ourselves to precomposed forms, which "puts a bar upon our spiritual faculties, and prevents their growth", "is very apt to make our spirits cold and flat, formal and indifferent", and "renders our converse with God very imperfect". Similarly in preaching (in words almost "lifted" from Baxter), "the minister must not read a prepared paper like a schoolboy but should have a few notes from which he could speak convincingly out of his own experience". In Watts this stress on experience was accompanied, as it often is, by a wide tolerance theologically, so wide, indeed, that to some it "seemed to be criminal heterodoxy". His own "explication of the Trinity", Mr. Davis admits, "was surely not that of the Athanasian Creed"; but "I ever own myself a protestant", Watts wrote, "and claim a right to think freely and judge for myself". The words are a salutary reminder that even in the eighteenth century not all Congregationalists can conveniently be confined within the covers of "orthodox Dissent"; and "very few figures in his century", Mr. Davis concludes, "have been so universally beloved" as Watts, "and few have been so worthy of such love".

"Only about five feet tall, with grey eyes, pale complexion, low forehead and prominent cheek bones, he was by no means a handsome man". This is hardly the effect created by the portrait on the book's wrapper, which (perhaps intentionally) is some degrees more "popular" than the book itself; but the publisher is right in desiring that no one should be frightened away, for the book is not in the least dull and should be read widely. Congregationalists may hope that Independent Press will provide many more volumes of like weight and permanent value.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

# SHORTER NOTICES & DESCRIPTIVE LIST

The reissue of the Rev. Edward Shillito's *Poetry and Prayer* (Independent Press, 4s.), first published in 1931, is very welcome. It is a book that has made a place for itself among devotional writings, for its understanding of the religious life, and because of its fine literary sense. The chapter on "Poetry and Intercession", with its interpretation of Browning, is perhaps the highlight of a beautiful book.

The Independent Press has now included in its reissue of P. T. Forsyth's works his *Cruciality of the Cross* (8s. 6d.). It contains papers and addresses on the Atonement, and works out in some detail Forsyth's view of man's redemption. The rather rhetorical manner detracts a little from the book, which is not Forsyth at his clearest. I have in my possession the address Forsyth delivered in 1891 from the chair of the Leicestershire Union on "The Old Faith and the New". It is very interesting as giving in embryo the things Forsyth taught in after years. I cannot remember ever seeing any reference to this very remarkable address.

The Rev. Harry Escott's *Peter Taylor Forsyth* (Epworth Press, 6s.) is an anthology from Forsyth's books, many of the quotations being from his less known works. It also contains some interesting selections from classroom notes taken by one of his students, the Rev. S. I. Blomfield. One aim of the anthology is to illustrate Forsyth's gift as a *director of souls*. Mr. Escott has added an appreciative essay on Forsyth.

Dr. R. J. Campbell's *The Life of the World to Come* (Longmans, 12s. 6d.) is in effect a wide survey of the Christian doctrine of the future life. It is addressed to those who accept psychical evidence for survival, but reject on one ground or another the Christian view, and the Christian evidences. But the book will be helpful to many others who are not entangled in "Spiritualist" diversions, and yet have difficulties. Dr. Campbell still has that gift of making contact with men which marked his early ministry, and he has written here a bit of sound Christian apologetic which fits the times.

The Rev. Crete Gray's *Colossians and Philemon* (Lutterworth Press, 5s.) is a running commentary on these two Epistles. It is clear and reliable; and it is very readable. *Colossians* is one of the most confusing of Paul's letters. Without going into detail Mr. Gray shows what was the Gnostic error which was invading the Church, and he brings out the main points of Paul's defence of the Gospel. He makes frequent use of Lightfoot.

Professor Henri Talon's *William Law* (Rockliff, 8s. 6d.) is described as "a study in literary craftsmanship", but it is also a good account of Law's opinions. Gibbon said of Law that he was "a wit" and also "a scholar". These qualities must be reckoned with in any study of Law's style; behind the severity of his appeal (did not Dr. Johnson find the *Serious Call* quite an overmatch for him?) there is always the disciplined mind, and an eye for mankind's absurdities. Thus Conatus, the country parson, "an honest man and very notable at making a bargain", is "very orthodox, and full of esteem for our English liturgy; and if he has not prayers on Wednesdays and Fridays, it is because his predecessor had not used the parish to any such custom". Still, as Prof. Talon says, the *Serious Call* was not written as a contribution to English *belles-lettres*. It was an attack. But it displays Law's literary craftsmanship at its meridian strength.

Fr. Aloysius Roche's *Bedside Book of English Saints* (Burns, Oates, 6s.) is a continuation of his former book which covered the Anglo-Saxon period. This volume covers some four hundred years from 1066; a very diversified period. This is a delightful book, written without any bitterness of ecclesiastical strife and abounding in good humour. The Saints here are not

seen only in their Sunday robes; you see their foibles, and what Cromwell would have called their warts. Speaking of the disputatiousness of many of these Saints, Fr. Roche admits that these contentions show them in a rather unattractive light; "but it is extremely doubtful", he says, "if mere placid amiability will get any of us canonized".

The Rev. S. H. Clark's *God and the Universe* (S.P.C.K., 7s. 6d.) was written during the years of his retirement after a long ministry. It is an outline of the Christian faith and of the Church in the light of his own experience. Mr. Clark had kept in touch with the changes of thought, but he inclined to the older ways. It is more a confession of faith than an argument; and there is a personal note which is attractive and helpful.

The Rev. R. G. Coulson's *The Way into God* (John Murray, 7s. 6d.) is a discussion of the mystic way, and it describes a method of contemplative meditation. A chapter is devoted to a meditation on the Divine attribute of Peace. Much as one's mind may run towards mysticism this seems an overdoing of things. Those who do not like mysticism will be at sea with much that the author says. Whatever be the Hellenic influence on early Christianity, the Gospel of the New Testament is not so much a Neo-Platonism as this book implies: the root of the Gospel is not a transformation, but a redemption. In plain words it springs from the Cross.

Mr. Hugh Kenner's *Paradox in Chesterton* (Sheed & Ward, 7s. 6d.) is an examination of G. K. Chesterton's use of paradox, and seems to suggest that behind the paradox was a deep Christian philosophy which Chesterton had stumbled on unawares. So the book has much to say about Aquinas, and becomes in the upshot an explanation of Chesterton the Roman propagandist. Chesterton, after his transition to Rome, went to seed in propagandism; he let his use of paradox become a wearisome mannerism, until he seemed to turn head over heels, and so reach truth. In theological controversy he has faded out. Possibly Mr. Kenner may do something to bring him back.

The Rev. R. L. Eddy's *Minister's Monday* (Pilgrim Press, $2.25) is a book on the minister's life and work. Mr. Eddy graduated from Harvard in 1938. His book has a certain liveliness of style which now and then will irritate his readers; but there is shrewd observation in it, something too of healthy impatience, and a sense of a high calling. Books on a minister's life and work are not easy to write, and what this book lacks is the quieter tone of experience. If in fifteen or twenty years' time Mr. Eddy will write another book on the same subject it will be different of course, and it will have some of those deeper notes which time teaches; but it could not be kindlier or more compact of goodwill towards his brother ministers than this book is.

M. François Mauriac's *Margaret of Cortona* (Burns, Oates, 9s. 6d.) is an account of one of the less known Saints. It has been translated from the French by Miss Barbara Wall. M. Mauriac found relief during the German occupation of France in reading the life of Margaret. This book is the fruit of his researches. It bears not a few marks of the tragic sufferings of France during those bitter years. It is a very able work of its kind.

A. T. S. JAMES.

In his Shaffer Lectures for 1946, which now appear under the title *Jesus What Manner of Man* (Macmillan, 11s. 6d.), Prof. H. J. Cadbury says he attempts to be more positive than in his earlier book, *The Peril of Modernizing Jesus*. The titles of the lectures ("Is not this Jesus?" "Whence this wisdom?" "Why speakest thou in parables?" "What is this? New Teaching!" "How knoweth this man?" "By what authority?") are questions asked in the Gospels, and the series forms "an unfinished questionnaire". How did Jesus think, and why did He think as He did? Wholly right is

Dr. Cadbury's insistence that He cannot be assessed by modern standards of judgment. Yet the very fact that he undertook the enquiry at all is an encouraging corrective to the tendency to conclude that all that we can know of Jesus is "a whisper of his voice", for the writer endeavours to see through the spoken word to the mind behind it. Here is much refreshing insight into the principles which guided His teaching—the *a fortiori* argument, analogy between natural and human life and spiritual truths, the principle of proportionate responsibility and the demand for a surplus from those capable of giving it ("The differentia of the Christian is the extra", p. 30). "The illustrations" (in the parables) "were the original sources of his own insights rather than adduced or employed to confirm insights independently arrived at" (p. 53). Jesus possessed these deep insights because He made the right response to life and its demands; He saw life in all its aspects as it really is. To such a teacher man may turn with glad confidence. But the whole discussion is on the purely human level. To most people it is not enough to be told that the authority of Jesus resides in His self-authenticating teaching as the fruit of His spiritual and moral perspicacity. The question whether He occupied a special rôle or experienced a unique relationship with God is passed by here in a few words.

*The Fourth Gospel as History* (Blackwell, 7s. 6d.), by the late Dr. A. C. Headlam, is prefaced by a biographical essay by Agnes Headlam-Morley, and concluded by a reproduction of an article in the *Church Quarterly Review*, 1946, on "The Historical Value of St. Mark's Gospel". The treatment of the Fourth Gospel contains nothing new. With frequent asides aimed at "the critics" the author arrives at the traditional positions. The Gospel is primarily theology, but theology based on history. It was written in Asia Minor in his old age by John, the son of Zebedee, the beloved disciple, who was an eye-witness of the events he records. The teaching of Jesus has been "translated from the language of Palestine at the beginning of the century into the language of Asia at the end".

In *The New Testament Doctrine of the 'Last Things'* (Oxford Press, 10s. 6d.) the Rev. H. A. Guy has summarized skilfully and lucidly the New Testament teaching on eschatology, and the varying views of scholars on the interpretation of that teaching, for the benefit both of the student and of the general reader. He begins at the proper place, with a study of Hebrew and Jewish eschatology, without which the New Testament teaching is unintelligible. There is no doubt that this book, with its convenient sub-divisions of the chapters, will be of real service to those desirous of acquiring the actual knowledge which is the foundation of any attempt to assess the relevance of Christian eschatology to these days, the end of an age, in which we live.

A useful help for the more elementary Bible reader is *The Gospel according to St. Luke, the Authorized Version explained in everyday English*, by Mr. E. C. Parnwell (Oxford Press, 2s.). In a column alongside the text are notes explaining words and phrases which, particularly because of the great changes which the English language has undergone since 1611, are obscure to many readers. There is an alphabetical reference index to the notes.

The difficulty felt about the Authorized Version is tackled in a different way in *The New Testament: Letchworth Version* (Letchworth, 12s. 6d.) by Messrs. T. F. and R. E. Ford. This is not so much a new version as a revision of the Authorized Version, with the replacement of archaic words and expressions by modern equivalents. The result is the loss to some extent of the hallowed cadences of the original translation, with none of that compensatory freshness which is the value of the best modern translations.

A. J. B. Higgins.

Some great men are greater than their creeds. In his new book entitled *The Challenge of Schweitzer* (Jason Press, 6s.), and called by himself an "essay in respectful iconoclasm", Mr. Middleton Murry combines incisive criticism of Schweitzer's philosophy with veneration of him as a man. Most of us feel the latter but are incapable of judging the former, and we may on that account be grateful for what Mr. Murry has done to relieve the perplexity aroused when such a Christian hero as Schweitzer proclaims such criticism of Christianity. Schweitzer's pessimistic *Weltanschauung* would seem to deprive his magnificent work at Lambaréné of any justification in his own fundamental convictions: that is the enigma, and the enigma remains. Only those who have read Schweitzer's philosophic works will find this book about him easy reading, but some will be drawn by it to turn to those larger works.

*The Book of the Revelation,* by the Rev. J. O. Barrett (Carey Press, 5s.), is a simple exposition by a working minister impressed with the relevance of the book to the Church as it faces menacing forces today. The author manages to introduce most of his convictions about the task of the Church and the salient aspects of the Christian faith. What one misses is the recognition that there is an element in the *Revelation* which defies calm exposition. It was a typically apposite dictum of Bengel's when he said that *Revelation* was neither written nor can be understood without tears.

*Saints against Cæsar,* by Mr. H. J. Schonfield (Macdonald, 12s. 6d.), is a study of Jewish Christianity in the first century A.D., completing a trilogy about Christian beginnings of which the former volumes were *Jesus: A Biography* and *The Jew of Tarsus*. It brings Jewish Christianity to life as a body with recognizable features, not as the mere ghost which is all that most scholars make of it; but there are too many questionable inferences from data. After all, Josephus is practically the only contemporary evidence outside the *N.T.* The Apocalypse is interpreted as a document of Nazarene defiance of Rome, originally written about 70 A.D., in Hebrew, by Simeon ben Cleophas, a relative of Jesus; and our Greek version was put out at the end of Domitian's reign (96 A.D.), probably by John the Elder, with editorial additions (*e.g.*, ch. 2, 3). A new translation is printed. Schonfield holds that Nazarene Christianity more faithfully represents the religion of Jesus than does Gentile Christianity, and thus claims every effort at reconstruction. This needs much more substantiation, and the assumption that the dogma of Christ's divinity was first introduced by Gentile Christians is uncritical.

E. C. Blackman.

*Religion* (Oxford University Press, 5s.), by Dr. Nathaniel Micklem, is a notable addition to the "Home University Library" and has a value out of all relation to its size. A short book on a vast subject is often either dull or superficial. This book escapes both dangers. It is written not only with a learning which it would be impertinent to praise but with complete lucidity. The beginner in this field will find no better introduction, whilst those who have read much on this subject will delight in the skill with which the material is presented, and will profit by the illuminating comparisons and comments. We recommend this book very warmly and are proud that it is written by one of ourselves.

Sydney Cave.

The growing company of Kierkegaard's readers will be indebted to Mr. T. H. Croxall for his presentation of Kierkegaard, the Biblical thinker "calling each of his contemporaries back to the fullest consciousness of his own individuality". His *Kierkegaard Studies* (Lutterworth Press, 15s.) are arranged in three sections: Man, Christianity, and God. The first part contains essays on Choice, Music, and Philosophy. Part Two is a lucid

progression from the concept of Dread, through kindred themes—Despair, Paradox, Hope, Time-Eternity—to Repetition, the recovery of the lost self. The last section comprises chapters on The Father, The God-Man, and The Holy Spirit. Mr. Croxall succeeds in relating Kierkegaard to the Bible and to our own age. He has 'lived' with Kierkegaard, and we anticipate eagerly the fulfilment of his promise to share with us more of the fruit of that intercourse.

CONRAD BONIFAZI.

One of the best books on the spirit and practice of public worship today which we have had for a number of years is *Concerning Worship* (Oxford Press, 8s. 6d.), by Dr. W. D. Maxwell. The essays range from Worship as Adoration and as An Offering to the Architectural Setting of Worship, and include topics as diverse as the use of silence, society and worship, and the Minister's robes. Written from the point of view of a minister of the Church of Scotland, it will be of value to all in the traditions of the Reformed Church, and an admirable companion to the new Congregational *Book of Public Worship*. Every final year theological student should include it in his reading, and most ministers will derive much profit from it.

To enable children to participate actively in worship either in the Sunday School or the Church, the Church of Scotland Committee on Public Worship have prepared their *Service Book for the Young* (Oxford Press, 4s. 6d.), and, from their standpoint, filled a yawning gap. There are varied orders for each department and for united services as well as for special occasions. Suggestions follow for lessons, praise, *etc.* On similar lines, though more individual in approach, is *The Book of Common Order for use in the Sunday School* (Oxford Press, 1s. 6d.). Even schools which cannot use these orders as they stand will find them mines of material and sure guides with a value beyond their price.

For those who may not be able to attend public worship and for those who are rediscovering family worship, the Rev. Wilton Rix has compiled *Family Prayers* (S.C.M., 2s. 6d.). He achieves his purpose with suggestions for hymns, readings, responses, and prayers planned for ten-minute acts of worship in family groups. The regular use of this small manual could do much to strengthen the devotional life of our families and of our churches.

*The Bible from Day to Day* (Oxford Press, 6s.) is an anthology of readings covering the essential passages of the Scriptures in portions of about 15 verses daily over a year. There are short introductory headings and a chronological table. The selection has been well done, but we doubt if the approach will move many to read the Bible who do not already do so.

KENNETH G. OGILVIE.

The late Lord Balfour once described H. H. Asquith as 'a master of concise statement'. So we may describe Sir Atul Chatterjee, whose *The New India* (Allen & Unwin, 8s. 6d.) is a masterpiece of compression and yet is so carefully written out of a vast knowledge as to be as easy to read for the general reader as it is valuable for the student. It is a short, comprehensive and authoritative account of the vast sub-continent from which British power but not British influence has now withdrawn. The complicated political issues arise out of the underlying facts of religion, history, geography and economics about which too little is generally known. We can no longer take India for granted, nor dismiss a country of nearly 400,000,000 people as outside the main current of the world's life. The author was a distinguished member of I.C.S., a member of the Viceroy's Executive Council and for seven years High Commissioner for India in London. He writes therefore of the peoples he knows for people he knows, and ignores current controversies.

The facts are staggering. Under the British Crown there were over 550 States scattered all over India, about 100 of them of real size and importance. The population of India in 1891 was 280 millions; in 1921, 306 millions; in 1941, 389 millions. These figures are a sufficient comment on the general character of British administration during the last fifty years, but they indicate a problem for which no solution is in sight, which is simply that the population increases as productivity increases and remains only just below starvation level. "There are in India over 600,000 villages, the great majority of them containing less than 500 souls". Problems of defence, administration, education, public health and leadership in all aspects of life are formidable, where the *per capita* income is variously estimated from £3 to £10 *per annum*. Nevertheless the book is marked by the tempered optimism of one who has always believed in Indian independence and the ability of the people to guide their own destinies. No one who cares about India should miss this book.

*Stop Looking and Listen: An Invitation to the Christian Life*, by Mr. Chad Walsh (S.C.M., 6s.), deserves a better title. Its author is an American don who "had the advantage of being an ardent Atheist from the time I first began to think about religion. No born and bred Christian can realize how alluring Christianity is when you are on the outside looking in". Mr. Walsh has come in and here describes with excitement and delight what he is finding. The influence of Mr. C. S. Lewis among others is acknowledged and is evident. The author claims nothing new in his presentation of Christianity, but writes with moving sincerity of what he has so far found of the unsearchable riches of Christ. He addresses his contemporaries, whose background like his own is scientific and materialistic, and he speaks their language. He appears to have studied the creeds more closely than he has read the Bible, and does not understand Biblical criticism. This is an interesting and appealing book, and for many reasons we hope and expect that it is not Mr. Walsh's last word.

*Secret Journey through Spain*, by Hr. Bjorn Hallstrom (Lutterworth Press, 3s. 6d.), is the account of a recent unauthorized journey through Spain and Spanish Morocco by a Swedish Protestant who wished to know what substance there was in Franco's declaration in 1947 that "no man shall be persecuted for his religious faith". He found there was none. He declares there is neither toleration nor freedom behind the Iron Curtain of the West. The Bible is forbidden literature, Protestant schools are closed, Protestant newspapers are banned and Protestant ministers of religion under constant surveillance. Nevertheless the author believes there are as many as 100,000 Protestants in Spain. The picture he paints is of a country governed by squalid tyranny, sunk in almost unbelievable superstition (many examples of which he quotes) and riddled with corruption. It is a major tragedy that the rest of the world is too preoccupied to care and that Franco's almost incredible government continues. The author's hope of deliverance of the persecuted minority from outside is not likely to be realized. Those who sneer at the Liberal way in religion and in politics may well look right as well as left with fear and trembling. The translation is pedestrian.

*The European Spirit*, by Dr. Karl Jaspers (S.C.M., 2s. 6d.), is a brilliantly written and translated essay by one of the outstanding Christian leaders of the obscurely named Existential school of philosophy now attracting so much attention on the Continent. It is not difficult to understand the large following Jaspers has among the University youth of Germany, for he is proclaiming a message of hope from the abyss of despair which in this country is not easily realized, the abyss where "the dead are no more; the dance of death hastens to fill the gaps and the dance goes on". Where, if anywhere,

amid the ruins of statecraft and culture shall be found a basis for life and work, Christian or indeed humanitarian? Is Europe "sinking into unconsciousness after the last pyrotechnic display, or is the mainspring of the European spirit at work that our life may soar again"? Jaspers' answer is in individual personal consciousness and the responsibility which have been for so long submerged in the thought and life of German youth. "The brightness falls now on the soaring flight of human existence". The strength and weakness of Jaspers' position is examined in an able introduction by the translator, Mr. Ronald Gregor Smith.

Miss Ruth Rouse's *The World's Student Christian Federation* (S.C.M., 12s. 6d.) is the history of the first thirty years of the remarkable work in the colleges and Universities of a movement which she herself did much to form and shape. Its contribution to the œcumenical movement is incalculable, both by showing that a world movement transcending ecclesiastical divisions had become possible and by training leaders and ministers of the future to think and feel œcumenically in their student days before their Christian convictions became too deeply canalized in traditional organization. The history is largely the story of men and women of vision and patience and abounding zeal, some of whom, like John R. Mott, have lived to see their work crowned but not ended by the World Conference at Amsterdam.

Prof. W. E. Rappard, of the University of Geneva, has written *Collective Security in Swiss Experience* (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.) because he believes that the only hope for Europe's survival lies in some form of federation such as has preserved the integrity and freedom of its oldest country, and has been achieved in spite of religious and linguistic diversities. The author readily admits the special circumstances of this merger of peoples and tongues, but, seeing no alternative for Europe between federation and anarchy leading to dictatorship, he hopes that the study of Swiss experience will help to guide Europe into safety and peace. The difficulties of federation increase in geometric proportion with the size and complexity of the countries concerned, but contemporary difficulties are so grave that this and every avenue must be explored. No student of international relationships, therefore, should miss this book.

J. M. PHILLIPS.

*The Concern for Social Justice in the Puritan Revolution,* by Dr. W. Schenk (Longmans, 15s.), is a useful and interesting study of certain radical social movements, such as those of the 'Levellers' and the 'Diggers', which emerged during and immediately after the Civil War. It is well documented, being based in the main on researches into contemporary pamphlets, and John Lilburne, Gerrard Winstanley, and other leading advocates of social reform are allowed to speak for themselves. Dr. Schenk shows convincingly that their ideals of social equality and human brotherhood were not merely political in character but religious (William Walwyn 'evidently regarded his entry into politics as the carrying out of a religious duty'), and he argues that these reformers had more in common with mediæval groups such as the Fraticelli than with modern materialistic communism.

WILFRED W. BIGGS.

By *The Noble Army of Congregational Martyrs* (Independent Press, 5s.) Dr. Albert Peel adds to the indebtedness which all Congregationalists owe for his untiring research. This is No. 1 of the publications of the International Congregational Council (Dr. Sidney Berry, as Moderator, writes the Foreword), and appropriately puts on record names and brief accounts of 160 of those of 'The Way' who between 1567 and 1944 laid down their lives for their faith and in the service of the Churches. This bead-roll of English,

American, Malagasy and other heroes will not be studied without inspiration and should prove a useful guide-book for talks to young people as well as to the student. CHARLES E. SURMAN.

In *The Rôle of Women in the Church* (Church Assembly Press, 7s. 6d.) Dr. C. M. Ady surveys all the fields of service open to women in the Church of England, and shows them to be more various than is generally supposed. Three chapters deal with the complementary rôles — "professed" and "ordained", professional, and voluntary workers—six with the scope and variety of the work. In her final chapter, "The Great Opportunity", Dr. Ady says that "within an ecclesiastical hierarchy" the situation as between men and women is, and must be, one of "ordered differentiation of function"; but she admits that "the attempt to maintain a differentiation of function between men and women members of the laity is as difficult to defend in theory as it is to maintain in practice". KATHLEEN L. CARRICK SMITH.

*Canonization and Authority in the Western Church,* by the Rev. E. W. Kemp (Oxford Press, 12s. 6d.), the first of a further "Oxford Historical Series", is a scholarly study of the development in the Church by which the acceptance of a Christian as a "saint" worthy of cultus passed from being a spontaneous local acclamation, as in the age of the martyrs, to being a formal declaration by authority, first in the person of the bishop, and eventually in the person of the Pope and no one but the Pope, "in virtue of his office". Such a development is very much what one would have expected, but it is all to the good to have it set out; and there are many interesting points made by the way, such as the political motives for some canonizations, or Thomas Netter's interpretation (1427) of *Acts* $2^{22, 32-36}$ as the canonization of Jesus.

The Northamptonshire Record Society, which, under the able leadership of Miss Joan Wake, sets an example to local historical bodies, is to be congratulated on *Northamptonshire Past and Present* (The Society, Lamport Hall, Northampton, 2s. 6d.), the first number of a new annual. An excellent paper on his family's history by Sir Gyles Isham, of Lamport Hall, where the Society is now splendidly housed, and another on Archbishop Henry Chichele (d. 1443) by Prof. E. F. Jacob, make this publication worth twice its price. It is finely illustrated.

"Education without religion is in itself a pure evil". This striking assertion was made by the Rev. Nathaniel Woodard (1811-1891), the founder of the Woodard Schools, now numbering 16, the Governing Corporation of which "forms the largest body dealing with secondary education outside the State". The eldest brother of this family of schools "whose character is derived from the central teachings of Christianity", Lancing, has now celebrated its centenary. In *Lancing College, 1848-1948* (Hove: Combridges, 5s.), Mr. Basil Handford provides a clear and well illustrated account of the school and its buildings.

The Bishop of Chelmsford's *Reflections of a Back-Bench Bishop* (Latimer House, 5s.) range from "The Parochial System" and "Reunion" to the wider issues of "Planning and Reform" and "The Outlook for Religion". He asserts that "Anglo-Catholicism has never attracted the laity in great numbers", and thinks it "not unlikely that the Evangelicals", who seem "at present rather cowed and 'under the weather' ", "might gain the dominating place in the Church in the near future". In reunion "the first and most obvious step is to welcome to our altars any baptized Nonconformist, who is a recognized member of his own communion".

It is a pity Dr. W. B. Selbie is not still with us to review Mrs. Joan Bennett's *George Eliot: Her Mind and Her Art* (Cambridge Press, 10s. 6d.),

for he was a great lover of George Eliot and would have rejoiced in this discriminating study by a critic who believes that "there is no English novelist who has more to offer the modern reader". Her book is divided into two parts. In the first she presents George Eliot's "Intellectual and Emotional Development" in her formative years, in terms of the relation, sometimes the conflict, between her "masculine" "intellectual energy" and her "essentially feminine" "emotional ardour", which together made her a great creative artist. There are some interesting pages on Herbert Spencer as well as on G. H. Lewes. In the second part Mrs. Bennett considers George Eliot's novels in turn ("it is the later works that appeal to us especially"). She suggests that George Eliot's sense for social environment may be compared and contrasted with Jane Austen's.

Bibliography is a highly specialized profession, but with A. W. Pollard, a bibliographer of international reputation, "scholarship . . . was not the first or even the second thing . . . ; what stood first was religion". In *Alfred William Pollard, 1859-1944* (Cumberlege, from Proc. Brit. Acad., 6s.), Prof. J. Dover Wilson shows him struggling with a lifelong stammer; bereaved of both his sons in the 1914-18 war; and picturing a Church with a Third Order, called "the Passionates, and they took upon them all the sins and sorrows of the world". GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

*To-Morrow's Men in Africa* (Livingstone Press, 2s. 6d.), by the Rev. R. K. Orchard, is the third of "Front Line Report" series, which contains accounts of the general impressions received and conclusions reached by officials of the London Missionary Society as the result of recent visits to some of the Society's mission fields. The impact of technology, and the pervasiveness of its influences in Africa, are vividly described. The vital, even crucial contribution that Christian missions can make to Africa in its need is forcefully stated.

*Towards a Literate Africa* (Longmans, 3s. 6d.) is the report edited by Mr. L. J. Lewis and Miss Margaret Wrong, of a Conference of Africans and Europeans held in December, 1947, under the auspices of the International Committee on Christian Literature for Africa and the Colonial Department of the University of London Institute of Education. All the participants had a practical interest in the subjects discussed, which ranged from linguistic principles to book distribution. The advances made in recent years in methods of teaching people to read have markedly diminished the size of the problem of making Africa literate and of maintaining its literacy. The report shows how considerable a part Africans can have in banishing illiteracy.

The most comprehensive survey of *The Outlook for Youth Work* that we know of is Mr. L. J. Barnes' report with that title, prepared for, and published by, King George's Jubilee Trust (3s. 6d.). The level of vision of the report is probably quite different from that of the ordinary youth worker, whether voluntary or paid. This makes a mastering of the report by leaders of youth all the more important. It is a "foreshadowing of future possibilities and desirabilities" which avoids airy speculation, yet considers trends and facts which have far-reaching consequences.

Mr. Clive Holland devotes the first 55 pages of *Thomas Hardy's Wessex Scene* (Dorchester: Longmans, 8s. 6d.) to a short biography of Hardy which gains in interest because of Mr. Holland's reminiscences of the man he knew. There follows a description of the principal places in Dorset and some facts about their past and present; then in slight and brief outline the scenes and stories of some representative novels are described. Hardy, and Wessex, devotees will enjoy all this reading, although its main value is as light introduction for the newcomer. At the end there is a full and valuable

topographical index, based on a list provided by Hardy for the author, in which actual place-names and those created by Hardy are placed side by side. HUGH R. DOLPHIN.

*Scottish Pageant 1513-1625* (Oliver & Boyd, 12s. 6d.), edited by Dr. A. Mure Mackenzie and published under the auspices of the Saltire Society, is the second in a series whose aim is to present "a picture of Scottish history as seen by those who lived through it and made it". All the 185 passages here collected were written by Scots or about Scotland, or both, and between them they touch upon almost every aspect of daily life in the period from the Battle of Flodden to the death of James VI. Like its predecessor, this volume contains much that is inaccessible to the general reader, and, like it again, succeeds admirably in combining instruction with entertainment.

Mr. Frederick Willis' *101 Jubilee Road* (Phœnix House, 15s.) is a detailed, unpretentious and charmingly written evocation of Edwardian London, the London of top hats and hansom cabs, of the music hall, Marie Corelli and 'Sherlock Holmes'. But this is not just another of those nostalgic chronicles by literary men or society leaders: Mr. Willis, who in those distant days was first a printer's boy and then a hatter, shows us the London of the artisan rather than the aristocrat. Though he is no sentimentalist, and does not shut his eyes to the failings of the past, he leaves us in no doubt as to where his sympathies lie. P. A. SPALDING.

Three new volumes which well maintain the high standard of the "English Novelists" series are *Kipling* by Mr. Rupert Croft-Cooke, *Bulwer-Lytton* by his grandson, the Earl of Lytton, K.G., and *Arnold Bennett* by Mr. Walter Allen (Home & Van Thal, 6s. each). Though perhaps none of these three diverse figures—Lytton, politician and man of affairs, Kipling, Anglo-Indian story-teller and country gent., Bennett, the provincial become man-about-town—is to be judged a great novelist, yet together they suggest something of the rich and healthy variety of English letters. And their novels show it: sentimental and melodramatic romanticism, the beginning of the regional novel, the clear-cut, almost pictorial tale. But it would be untrue to define three such writers within such narrow limits, and it is satisfactory that the present studies deal only briefly with the biographical material, giving greater scope to a fuller treatment of the novels.

*Essays From Tula* (Sheppard Press, 12s. 6d.) is a selection of the later writings of Leo Tolstoy in the years when his concern is no longer that of the novelist but of the teacher and social reformer. The present essays, probably little known in this country, are typical of his hatred of force, his moralism, his utopian optimism, his anarchism. There is a short critical introduction by Nicholas Berdyaev.

Dr. Gilbert Murray continues with unabated skill his work of translator and impresario of the Greek Dramatists with a pleasing edition of Sophocles' *Œdipus At Colonus* (Allen & Unwin, 5s.). This may not be one of the greatest of the plays, but it has great passages and most dramatic moments. Dr. Murray's English verse is at least readable and often moving.

If we cannot have the whole to feast on it is no doubt better to have the selection of a dead poet's work made by a living poet. This is provided for us (and a very generous selection it is) by Mr. Richard Church in *John Keats* (Phœnix House, 8s. 6d.). In his introduction Mr. Church claims that Keats has a particular value for people today who have been taught to appreciate political and economic man but not the sanctity of the individual. He also contrasts Keats' Shakespearean quality of personal anonymity or selflessness (for all his apparent immaturity) with the doctrinaire partisanship of much verse in these past three decades.

Mr. Robert Sencourt obviously brings to the writing of *St. Paul* (Hollis & Carter, 16s.) many years of reading, along with a personal familiarity with the scenes and atmosphere of the Eastern Mediterranean world. The result is a full and readable account of the Apostle's life, work and letters, with more than adequate documentation which is fortunately kept for the appendices and notes at the end of the volume. Where there is no documentary evidence Mr. Sencourt is quite ready to follow tradition or his own surmise.

In a thousand lines of bright and tripping verse, entitled *The Norman Church* (Methuen, 5s.), Mr. A. A. Milne disposes of God and encourages man to go on to be "the master of things".

> For how can man aspire to find
> A God outside the human mind?

All the old arguments and stumbling-blocks appear: the discrepancies of Scripture, Miracle, the Cross and Resurrection, the failings of the Church, *etc.* So Christianity is put out of court, along with all other faiths except for a belief in a vague, pantheistic Creative Spirit and in the future of Evolutionary Man.

> This is our world. No need to grieve
> For other worlds, if Death can leave
> Some seed of us to fructify
> When we beneath the earth shall lie.

*Behold Your King,* by Miss F. M. Bauer (Dublin: National Press, 12s. 6d.), is a "popular" treatment in the form of a novel of the events and persons at the beginning of our era. It tells the story of a certain young Jonathan of Cyrene who comes to Jerusalem in time to be caught up in "the greatest drama of the world". The background is quite well drawn, but the dialogue is often stilted and archaic. K. W. WADSWORTH.

*Fable Plays,* by Mr. Rodney Bennett (Harrap, 7s. 6d.), are verse plays, based on five of Æsop's fables and one Russian fable, for children from primary to 'teen age, with "part" learning made easy, because written in rhyme: they are full of humour of word and action, and will delight youngsters, to say nothing of their adult audiences. Ideal for Sunday School and Young People's Concerts. J. S. WRIGHT.

## SMALL BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

The first three studies of "Servants of the Universal Church", a new series published by Student Movement Press (1s. each), are: *Jungle Doctor: The Story of Albert Schweitzer,* by Dorothea Salmon; *Nathan Söderblom: Apostle of Christian Unity,* by the Rev. H. G. G. Herklots; and *Charles Henry Brent: Ambassador of Christ,* by Frederick W. Kates. These studies communicate the spirit of these men to the reader. It is a pity that Miss Salmon tells us next to nothing about Schweitzer's life and work in the past 25 years.

A further appreciation of Schweitzer is *Reverence through Schweitzer* (Lindsey Press, 6s.), by the Rev. Magnus C. Ratter.

Mr. Horace Shipp's selection of *Lives that Moved the World,* Second Series (Evans, 5s.), consists deliberately of men and women who did not find their primary motive and strength in Christianity. Eleven short biographies of remarkable people are provided.

*Little Miss Pink* and *Little Miss Pink at Greytoes* (Harrap, 3s. 6d. each) are delightful books for small people. The stories are by Rodney Bennett and the charming illustrations by Astrid Walford.

Mrs. K. F. Morton's *The Animals of Buttermilk Hall* (Harrap, 5s.) contains real life stories of wild and tame animals and birds. They are written by a country dweller who is keenly observant and understands the creatures of the countryside. It would make an excellent present for a boy or girl with these interests.

Two stories with an Indian setting and revealing a few of the difficulties of Christian Missions, are *The Priceless Jewel* (3s.), an exciting tale for boys and girls,

and *Romoni's Daughters* (3s. 6d.), which will interest particularly adolescents and youth. Both are by D. S. Batley and published by Livingstone Press. At times the author writes somewhat stiffly, but he has a gift for plot construction and more than holds the interest of the reader.

*The South Seas Book* (Livingstone Press, 4s.), edited by Miss Joyce Reason, is a good introduction for children to life and missionary work—past and present—in the groups of islands where the London Missionary Society labours. A variety and wealth of information is attractively presented. This should prove an acceptable gift book.

The first 37 pages of Mr. R. C. Smith's *Talking to Children* (Lutterworth Press, 5s.) contains advice on how and how not to do it, with many helpful observations—verified in his experience as a schoolmaster—about the psychology of boys and girls of different ages and the technique of speaking to them. Then, somewhat daringly, he provides us with sixteen of his own religious talks. Readers will doubtless give him a pass mark; it is not so certain that he will be awarded honours.

M. Emile Cammaerts' *The Work of The Christian Cell* (Mowbray, 1s. 6d.), reprinted from the *Church Quarterly Review*, will answer most of the questions enquirers are likely to ask about this movement, and gain a warm response—perhaps somewhat nostalgically—from believers in the "gathered" Church.

HUGH R. DOLPHIN.

## LECTURES, ADDRESSES, *ETC.*

*Poetry and Religious Experience* both bring "a heightened awareness and a feeling of unity", says Mr. Clive Sansom in an address obtainable for 7d. from 16 Ivymount Road, S.E.27. Poetry, says Professor Gilbert Murray, is "engaged in putting across to other minds something that is, strictly speaking, not fully expressible, something that belongs to the unfathomed mystery by which the mind of man is surrounded". This is from his Andrew Lang Lecture, *Andrew Lang, The Poet* (Cumberlege, 2s. 6d.), a powerful defence of the older kind of poetry at present out of fashion, which took poetic diction and poetic form seriously, and for which "Tradition is all". Prof. Murray cares nothing for the charge of "escapism" and is content to be "homesick for he knew not what". A more positive approach is to be found in the fine Academy Annual Shakespeare Lecture with which Prof. Una Ellis-Fermor has followed her Inaugural Lecture on *The Study of Shakespeare*. In this, *Shakespeare the Dramatist* (Cumberlege, from Proc. Brit. Acad., 2s. 6d.), she pursues her perception of simultaneous "self-identification with each and every character" as "the genuine dramatic mode of thought" which Shakespeare possessed uniquely, and claims that "this universal sympathy which has at once the balance of impersonal detachment and the radiance of affection, gives to the record made and to the reading of life implied a power of assurance beyond that of any utterance short of the affirmation of the mystic".

"Gratuities were fundamental in Elizabethan Court life". This is the text of Prof. J. E. Neale's Raleigh Lecture on History, *The Elizabethan Political Scene* (Cumberlege, from Proc. Brit. Acad., 4s.), a study of "the effect of the system on the structure of politics". "The standard of public morality was declining sharply during the last decade or so of the reign", "and the scandal and discontent caused by a putrefying political system helped to provoke the Civil War".

In view of the fashionable condemnation of Descartes for his "subjective bias", Mr. S. V. Keeling showed a refreshing independence in choosing *Descartes* for the subject of the 1948 Lecture on a Master Mind (Cumberlege, from Proc. Brit. Acad., 4s.). While allowing that Descartes' system is too "completely geometrico-kinematical" and inapplicable to the organic, and also that *we* know that "in going to the extremity we shall arrive at an insuperable barrier—the irrational", Mr. Keeling urges "his great merit" in applying the scholastic dictum *entitates non sunt multiplicandae* to thought and thus accepting "the fewest possible ultimates".

Another Frenchman, Montesquieu, provides the context for Dr. Charles Morgan's Zaharoff Lecture, *The Liberty of Thought and the Separation of Powers* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2s.); its text is his words *Il faut que le pouvoir arrête le pouvoir*. It is heartening to read an attack on the present subordination of the Legislature to the Executive through Orders in Council (and much else) as "flouting every principle of balance . . . upon which our own Revolution Settlement was based"; a direct attack on the liberty of thought is shown to be involved.

"Civilization everywhere and at its best is still sub-Christian". This is the sane conclusion of Bishop E. H. Burgmann's William Ainslie Memorial Lecture, *The Church's Encounter with Civilization* (Longmans, 2s.), which is illustrated from the behaviour of the white man in Australia.

Many readers of this *Quarterly* owe much to Dr. Williams' Library, yet hardly know who Dr. Williams was. If they will read Mr. S. K. Jones' *Dr. Williams and*

*his Library* (2s., from the Librarian, 14 Gordon Square, W.C.1), they will obtain much information (spiced with humour), and may be led to join the Friends of the Library, under whose auspices this Inaugural Annual Lecture was delivered.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

## NEW EDITIONS

The Home University volume on *Parliament* by Sir C. Ilbert has appeared in a new edition by Sir C. Carr at 5s. A mine of information which every citizen ought to know.

Miss Margery Perham's and Mr. Jack Simmons' *African Discovery*, an anthology from the writings of British explorers in Africa in the period 1768 to 1873, has appeared among Penguin Books (1s. 6d.).

The Rev. Leslie D. Weatherhead's *A Plain Man Looks at the Cross* (Independent Press, 6s.) is now in its seventh edition.

*Shadows of Ecstasy* (Faber, 8s. 6d.), typical of the exciting strangeness of the novels of the late Mr. Charles Williams, is now added to the new standard edition of his work.

## ALSO RECEIVED

THE first two of the popular "Vital Religion Booklets" (6d. each) published by the Congregational Union of Scotland are the Rev. C. T. Rae's *Can Religion Help?* and Prof. James Wood's *Why I am a Congregationalist* . . . 'rather than a Presbyterian', the Scottish context implies; so this booklet should be studied by English Congregationalists intent on union with Presbyterians.

Mrs. W. Maude Brayshaw's noble broadcast address on *The Significance of Jesus Christ for the World as it is to-day* is obtainable for 3d. from Friends Peace Committee, Friends House, N.W.1.

In *Infant Baptism To-day* (Carey & Berean Presses, 6d.) Principal Wm. Robinson collects modern statements relative to the *N.T.* evidence, Principal P. W. Evans considers the doctrinal issues, and Principal Henry Townsend relates baptism and the Christian Ethic.

The Society for Old Testament Study's annual *Book List*, edited by Prof. H. H. Rowley, contains much useful information about English and Continental literature, and is also valuable in indicating books which are suitable for use in schools. The 1948 number is obtainable for 3s. 6d. from Prof. G. Henton Davies, 3 The Dell, Westbury-on-Trym, Bristol.

The Lutterworth Press, S.C.M., and S.P.C.K. have joined in publishing *A Popular Bibliography of the Christian Faith* (36 pp.) and a more advanced *General Bibliography of Christian Theology, History, and Apologetic* (48 pp.) at 3d. each, both with brief notes.

*Book of Common Order for Use in The Sunday School.* Compiled by William McMillan. Oxford, 1s. 6d. There are Forms of Service for a period of two months and special occasions.

*The King of Glory.* Gordon Rupp. Epworth Press, 1s. Short studies in *Colossians* which should prove widely helpful. There are questions for group discussion.

*Club Pulpit.* Geoffrey L. Treglown. Methodist Youth Department, 3s. 6d. Contains nearly 100 three-minute sermons for youth clubs.

*How to Read the Synoptic Gospels.* Henry Scott Holland. S.P.C.K., 9d. Three lectures delivered in 1909 which are refreshing and helpful to read now.

*Can We be Religious To-Day?* Replies by an Ex-R.A.F. Padre, Schoolmaster, Scientist, and liberal Churchman. Union of Modern Free Churchmen, 2s.

From Harrap. *Alastair of the Isles.* Jan Macdonald. 3s. 6d. Well told tales of Alastair and other members of the Macalister family, which capture the atmosphere of the Hebridean Islands. *A Night on Peter's Mountain.* Eileen Mathias. 3s. 6d. Imaginative stories for children.

*Seven Times Once Upon A Time.* Carwal Pub., 5s. Margaret and Mary Baker. Seven stories with happy endings which children should enjoy.

*Treasure Trove.* R.E.P., 4s. Thirteen Stories for boys and girls collected by Dr. Roderic Dunkerley. Several have been rewritten.

From Lindsey Press. *The Divine Experiment.* Philip Milner Oliver. 6d. Contains the script of a broadcast and an exposition of the same theme. *A Free Religious Faith in Outline.* Raymond V. Holt. 6d. Originally appeared as an Introduction to the Report, *A Free Religious Faith.*

*The Flannelgraph Story of John Wesley.* Distributed by Methodist Youth Department. 3s. 6d. Well planned and produced.

# PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS

*Hibbert Journal* (Oct.). Dr. L. P. Jacks—"The Cinderella of the Values"—pleads powerfully that the Beautiful be assiduously courted; to neglect her, he suggests, is "something akin to sin against the Holy Ghost". "Pascal's Meditations on Society" by Dr. W. Stark, and "Pascal and Kierkegaard" by the Rev. J. M. Lloyd Thomas reflect the topical interest in the "Theology of Crisis". Mr. Reginald Lennard deals realistically with "The Threat to Academic Freedom" which he sees in the increasing State aid now given to universities. In "By What Authority?" Mr. Hamilton Fyfe asserts that democracy has disappointed its advocates, and suggests that the shape of things to come is outlined in James Burnham's *The Managerial Revolution*. Prof. H. D. Lewis has a long review-article on Emil Brunner's *Revelation and Reason*.

*London Quarterly and Holborn Review* (Oct.). In "The Deprivation of Love as a cause of illness and the relevance thereto of Religion", Dr. L. D. Weatherhead supports and expounds Dr. J. A. Hadfield's view "that neurosis is largely, if not entirely, traceable to a deprivation of love in the life of the patient". The Rev. D. R. Davies, prompted by the publication of Dr. F. A. Iremonger's *Life*, writes "Recollections and Impressions of Archbishop Temple"; "had he been granted another five years of life . . . he might very well have emerged as one of the supreme theologians of our age". The Rev. Frank Baker deals with "The Relations between the Society of Friends and Early Methodism"; the Rev. W. S. Handley Jones writes on "G. K. Chesterton and the Discovery of Christianity"; and the Rev. A. Skevington Wood gives a digest of "Luther's Bedside Manual"—the *Tessaradecas Consolatoria*. An Anglican, the Rev. Selwyn Gummer, has an appreciative article on "Peter Taylor Forsyth: A Contemporary Theologian".

*Expository Times* (Aug.-Nov.). The series of "Unsolved New Testament Problems" is continued by the Rev. C. K. Barrett ("The Place of Eschatology in the Fourth Gospel"); the Rev. C. L. Mitton ("Goodspeed's Theory Regarding the Origin of Ephesians"); and Dr. Matthew Black ("The 'Son of Man' in the Old Biblical Literature" and "The 'Son of Man' in the Teaching of Jesus"). In "Preaching and Theology in the Thirteenth Century and Today", the Rev. I. A. Muirhead elaborates the theme "that preaching cannot live without theology"; the Rev. R. A. Hickin's "Niebuhr on Progress and Sin" is, in effect, a commentary on *The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness*. Two articles are devoted to the work of the World Council of Churches at Amsterdam: (1) "The Church" by Prof. Leonard Hodgson; and (2) "The Church's Witness to God's Design" by Prof. John Foster.

*Church Quarterly Review* (July-Sept.). Lord Quickswood's article on "Christian Reunion" is prompted by the consummation of the South Indian scheme, of which he most heartily disapproves. Is it correct to say, as the Rev. H. A. Hodges does in an article on "Art and Religion", that "The sole purpose of an organ voluntary is to cover people's movements in and out of a building. The real purpose of some hymns is to give the congregation something that will keep them interested while the priest is doing something that they do not know or care about"? The Rev. Thomas Wood writes on "An Anglican Manual"—Canon Mortimer's *The Elements of Moral Theology;* in "Confirmation in Other Days", the Rev. W. J. Brown concludes that today candidates are more carefully prepared and the rite administered with a greater reverence.

*Modern Churchman* (Sept.). Prints the papers and addresses given at the 31st Annual Conference on "The Necessity for a Christian Modernism". At their best they are informed by spiritual insight and sound learning; only occasionally does a speaker adopt a markedly defensive attitude or lapse into an exaggerated self-consciousness. Christian Modernism is examined from many angles: its relationship to Barthianism is discussed by the Rev. J. S. Boys Smith; to Education by Sir Cyril Norwood and Miss Alice Ashley; to World Evangelism by Dr. A. C. Bouquet; to Philosophical Theology by the Rev. W. Richardson; and to Church Unity by the Rev. D. E. H. Whiteley. Sir Henry Self writes on its necessity, and Prof. S. A. Cook on its causes. Dean Inge is stimulating on "Modernism True and False".

*Review and Expositor* (July). Dr. T. B. Maston has a number of good (though not new) things to say about "Christianity and Communism"; his article suffers from over-compression. Prof. R. T. Daniel writes usefully on "Jonah's Timeless Message". Other articles deal with "The Conception of God in the Bhagavad-Gita", "Evangelism in New Testament Terms" and "Religion and the Family in a Divided World".

*International Review of Missions* (Oct.). Prof. John Foster writes knowledgeably on "The Bicentenary of Jonathan Edwards' 'Humble Attempt' ", which he finds prophetic despite its eschatological inaccuracies. In his Amsterdam address—"The Missionary Legacy to the Church Universal"—Dr. John A. Mackay claims that

the Œcumenical Church is a child of the missionary movement. Dr. Jakob Jocz has a learned article on "The Jewish-Christian Controversy Concerning Israel"; he deals particularly with the question of election. "Fear, Duty and Love as Ultimate Motives for Christian Missions" by Prof. Nels F. S. Ferré, is typical, realistic and challenging. First-hand reports come from Miss Mary Senior ("Women in the African Village Church"), Dr. D. D. Chelliah ("The Growth of Unity among the Churches in Malaya"), the Rev. H. J. Teutscher ("Some Mission Problems in Post-war Indonesia: Experiences in Dutch New Guinea") and the Rev. E. F. F. Bishop ("The Jerusalem That Now Is").

*Anglican Theological Review* (July). Dr. H. P. Van Dusen writes of the present time under the heading, "Revolution—and Christian Response"; the response must be in terms of reformation and revival. "Trends in Old Testament Introductions from 1930 to the Present" are noted by the Rev. John H. Scammon; the time is ripe, he asserts, for the production of an "Old Testament Introduction of the nature of a symposium, to which Protestant, Catholic and Jewish scholars would contribute". More than half of the number (32 pp.) is devoted to reviews.

*Religion in Life* (Autumn). Three contributions might usefully be considered together: (1) "Two Concepts of Death" by Dr. J. G. Brennan, who contrasts the humanist or naturalist attitude with the religious view; (2) "Some Thoughts on the Christian Hope" by Dr. C. C. Richardson—an orthodox, but interesting, interpretation of the classic Christian symbols; and (3) "The Language of the Faith" by the Rev. C. D. Kean. "The Possibility of Methodist and Episcopal Union" is lengthily discussed by a Methodist, the Rev. P. S. Sanders, who thinks that "such a union would offer special values to the œcumenical movement". Valuable contributions include "Church, School and Supreme Court" by Dr. F. E. Johnson; "Sex Standards and Christian Teaching" by Prof. S. M. Duvall; and "The Spiritual State of the World Today" (a lecture delivered in 1931) by Nicholas Berdyaev.

*Huntingdon Library Quarterly* (Aug.). In "The Puritan Preacher's Contribution to Fiction", Prof. Kathrine Koller sees a logical growth; her purpose is "to point out the relationship between the Puritan method of instruction based on the medieval tradition and the development of the moral fiction of the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries". Mr. Robert Hine writes interestingly on "A California Utopia: 1885-1890"—the socialist experiment in Kaweah Colony initiated by Burnette G. Haskell. Other contributions include Prof. W. R. Mueller's "Robert Burton's Economic and Political Views", and Prof. E. N. Hooker's "Humour in the Age of Pope".

*Friends' Quarterly* (Oct.). "The Vocation of Barclay" is a chapter from Prof. D. Elton Trueblood's forthcoming book on Barclay, whose place in, and importance for, the developing Society of Friends is stressed. William E. Wilson writes intimately on "Rendel Harris, Quaker and Evangelical" (the conjunction is definitive). Fred Irvine pleads that due recognition be accorded to "The African in our Midst"; he adorns his argument with two pointed stories of John Woolman.

*Baptist Quarterly* (April-July). Mr. Seymour J. Price pays a graceful tribute to W. T. Whitley, whom he describes as "the outstanding British Baptist historian". Of topical interest is "The Church and Communism" by the Rev. B. G. Collins; the Rev. G. R. Beasley-Murray concludes his contribution—"A Conservative Thinks Again about Daniel".

*Teachers of Today* (Sept.-Nov.). Mr. Sydney Taylor has an article—"Mid-Century Madness"—deploring the neglect of religious values; his cartoon—"The Boy Replies"—reveals the tendency (and the weakness) of much present-day teaching and youth work. The Rev. J. Clark Gibson continues his series—"Our New Social Problem"—with "The Parent and the Gambling Mentality".

*Yale Review* (Autumn). References to President Truman's great handicap and extraordinary *naïveté* and to Governor Dewey's amazing opportunity make interesting reading in the light of the Democratic victory. Mr. M. W. Childs writes on the "Year of Doubt" and Mr. Alvin Johnson on "Party and Ideology in America". "An Outsider's View" is contributed by Prof. D. W. Brogan. Literary subjects receive ample attention with articles by Mr. Wallace Stevens on "Effects of Analogy", Prof. Harry Levin on "Flaubert and the Spirit of '48", and Mr. Leslie Hotson on "Ancient Pistol" (Falstaff's follower). Mr. D. Lee Hamilton deals objectively with "The Brazilian Scene", and Prof. H. A. DeWeerd assesses "The Reputation of Rommel".

H. CUNLIFFE JONES.